Volume XXI, No. 2 January 1950

JOURNAL

OF

THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY

Section A. Humanities

Editor

DR. R. BALAKRISHNA, M.A., PH.D.

Editorial Board

DR. G. KURIYAN, B.A., B.SC., PH.D.
DR. T. M. P. MAHADEVAN, M.A., PH.D.
MR. V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR, M.A.
MR. P. SAMBAMURTI, B.A., B.L.
MRS. ELLEN SHARMA, M.A., M.ED.
MR. R. BHASKARAN, M.A.

9345

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
MADRAS
1950

93189

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RANDAULA KHAN AND THE KARNATAK
By T. V. Mahalingam .. 127

REV. DR. KERR, THE UNKNOWN SOCIAL WORKER OF MADRAS IN THE XVIII CENTURY
By M. Arokiaswami .. 132

THE CONCEPT OF ECONOMIC COMPLEMENTARITY
By R. Balakrishna .. 137

THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION AND A CONCEPTION OF SECULAR STATE
By N. Rama Bhat .. 145

BOOK REVIEWS .. 155

Supplement

DEMOCRACY IN CONTEMPORARY INDIA
By Dr. C. R. Reddy, M.A. (Cantab), D.Litt.
Vice-Cancellor of The Andhra University .. 1

RANDAULA KHAN AND THE KARNATAK

BY

T. V. MAHALINGAM

The Vijayanagar empire received a rude shock at the battle of Raksas Tangadi in 1565 as a result of its defeat at the hands of the Muslim allies; but it survived and continued for another century with a fresh lease of life. However the rulers of the Vijayanagar dynasty removed their capital first to Penugonda and later to Chandragiri and Vellore. In the course of the seventeenth century the hold of the Vijayanagar kings over the outlying parts of the empire weakened with the growing power of the provincial governors who were generally called *nāyakas.* About 1640 the chief among them were Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri (Shimoga district in the Mysore state), Kanthīrava Narasa Oḍeyār of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, Kengu Nāyaka in the Kongu or Coimbatore country, Vijayarāghava Nāyaka in Tañjāvūr and Tirumalai Nāyaka in distant Madhurai. The growing weakness of the central organisation in the Empire was taken advantage of by the Muslim courts of Bījāpur and Golkoṇḍa which wanted to bring under their control as much of the Vijayanagar territories as possible to compensate their territorial losses in the north on account of the pressure exerted by the Mughals. In fact the two Muslim states made an agreement among themselves with regard to the conquest of the Karṇāṭaka according to which the western portion of the conquered region was to go to Bījāpur and the eastern portion to Golkoṇḍa. The attempts of the Vijayanagar emperors Venkaṭapati and Śrīranga to organise united resistance to the Muslim invaders did not prove successful on account of the mutual jealousy and general disunity among the Nāyakas. In fact some of the southern Nāyakas are said to have rebelled against Venkaṭa III in 1637 and fought against him.[1] But details about it are lacking. Without realising the need for unity and concerted action among them to save the country from Muslim aggression some of them actually sought the Muslim help to settle their internal disputes. In this paper an account is given of the course of the conquest of the Western

1. Macleod, *De Oost Indische Compagnie,* II, p. 170.

Karṇāṭaka between 1637 and 1640 by the Bījāpur general Randaulā Khān ably assisted by Shāhjī the father of Śivajī.

Randaulā Khān appears to have carried out his conquest of the Karṇāṭaka in different stages. But before the Muslim general undertook his expedition against Western Karṇāṭaka he played the role of a diplomat to strengthen his position. He thought that since the semi independent chieftains in the area were technically subordinate to the Vijayanagar emperor Venkaṭa III, his attack of any one of them might involve him in a war against Venkaṭa and therefore he proposed an alliance with the emperor to subjugate the recalcitrant chiefs of the Karṇāṭaka. According to the proposal Randaulā Khān was to have no territorial gains, but only the available movable properties in the course of his invasion of their territories. Venkaṭa apparently in a moment of weakness agreed to the proposal, but soon realising the underlying motives of the Muslim general, he declined to abide by the terms of the agreement. Finding that his plan was frustrated Randaulā Khān made an alliance with Śrīranga, a nephew of the emperor. Randaulā Khān instigated him to rebel against the emperor.[2]

After making such preparations Randaulā Khān turned his attention to the conquest of the Karṇāṭaka. The first kingdom to be conquered by him was Ikkēri. The causes for the invasion are not so easy to find. According to the accounts of Govinda Vaidya and Tirumalaryya Kenge Hanuma who was on terms of enmity with Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri (his master) requested the Sultan of Bīāpur to invade Ikkēri with a view to annihilate it and promised him large presents. But according to Linganna, one Sadāśivayya, a brother-in-law of Vīrabhadra Nāyaka made a futile attempt with the help of the chieftains of Sode (Sudhapura) and Bilige to oust Vīrabhadra Nāyaka from the throne. Sadāśivayya soon died, and the ruler of Ikkēri conquered the principalities of Sode and Bilige. The chiefs appealed to the Sultan of Bījāpur for help and an army was sent to help them to recover their lost principalities. In the meantime Vīrabhadra Nāyaka also sent his secretary to the Bījāpur court, to explain to the Sultan his own position *vis-a-vis* Śadāśivayya. As a result of that, Virābhadra Nāyaka was recognised as ruler of Ikkēri but he was required to restore the principalities of Sode and Bilige to their respective rulers. But soon one Venkaṭappah of Tarekere apparently another

2. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Dr. N. Venkataramanayya : *Further sources of Vijayanagar History* I, pp. 341-42.

recalcitrant feudatory of the ruler of Ikkēri, appears to have induced the Sultan of Bījāpur to invade Ikkēri. Taking advantage of the new situation the Sultān sent Randaulā Khān for the conquest of the kingdom. The city of Ikkēri was soon attacked by the Muslim general. Vīrabhadra Nāyaka offered resistance for sometime, but finding that his position was growing weak, he retired to the fortress of Bhuvanagiri along with his family. Randaulā Khān assisted by Kenge Hanumappa Nāyaka attacked Bhuvanagiri with a large army of 40,000 horse, 100,000 foot and 40 elephants. Finding further resistance impossible, Vīrabhadra Nāyaka sued for peace, and according to the treaty that was concluded the ruler of Ikkēri gave up his claims to the conquered forts; and he was allowed to rule over the remaining part of his kingdom on terms of subordination.[3] According to Linganna Ikkēri fell in 1560 Īśvara Puṣya Bahula daśami corresponding to 30th December 1637.

Early in 1638 Randaulā Khān turned his attention to the other portions of Western Karṇāṭaka. The Bījāpur general's invasion of the region synchronised in point of time with the rebellion of Śrīranga, the nephew of the emperor. Venkaṭa immediately marched with an army of 25,000 to the place where his nephew revolted, but when he heard that the western Karṇaṭaka was being invaded by the Bījāpur general with an army of 90,000 and that Bangalore had been reached by him, Venkaṭa returned back to his capital Vellore and appealed to his Nāyakas for help against the Muslim invader.[4] But Randaulā Khān continued his march to Bangalore. On the way he took Sira and appointed Shāhjī as governor of the place. Then he besieged the fort of Śrīraṅgapaṭṭaṇam for a month, but however raised it on receipt of an indemnity of 5 lakhs of *hons* from Kanthirava Narasa, its ruler and returned back to Bījāpur.

Kenge Hanumappa who was till then loyal to the Sultān of Bījāpur and had helped Randaulā Khān in his expeditions into the Karṇāṭaka revolted, and therefore to punish him the Muslim general once again marched into the Karṇāṭaka. According to Singanna, however, Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri wanted the help of Bījāpur for bringing back under his control the chiefs of Tarekere and Basavāpaṭṭaṇam and sent one Ramakṛṣṇappa, a *niyogi* in his service to carry on negotiations with the Sultān for the purpose. The Sultān agreed to the suggestion and again sent down Randaulā

3. *Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission*, Vol. XVI, pp. 50-51. *Further Sources*, I, pp. 341-2.

4. Macleod, *De Oost Indische Compagnie*, II, p. 173.

Khān to help the chief. The combined Ikkēri-Bījāpur forces attacked Tarekere and Basavāpaṭṭaṇam.[5]

The brothers of Kenge Hanumappa were taken prisoners by Afzal Khan a lieutenant of Randaulā Khān. Finding further resistance hopeless Kenge Hanuma offered to Randaulā Khān a large indemnity, surrendered his city and sued for peace. In the meanwhile Shāhjī marched on Bangalore and captured the fort from Kempe Gauda who was in charge of it. The Maratha lieutenant made the newly conquered city his headquarters from where he controlled the southern territories. During his stay at Bangalore he reduced Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam to obedience.[6]

The appeal that was made to his subordinates by the Vijayanagar emperor Venkaṭa III to check the aggressions of the Sultan of Bījāpur in the Karṇāṭaka met with some response: Venkaṭa was able to have an army of 13000 men with him early in 1639 and with that he invaded the Karṇāṭaka region that had been taken by the Muslims in the previous year. But he was not successful in his attempt, and therefore returned back to Vellore after promising the enemy 27 tons of gold, elephants, horses, jewels, etc. of which four lakhs had to be paid immediately. Towards the end of the year once again he marched to the Karṇāṭaka with an army of 20,000 to recapture Bangalore but had to retrace his steps when he heard that Randaulā Khān was then in the Karṇātaka and had taken Basavāpaṭṭaṇam.[7] But the loss of a part of his empire still rankled in Venkaṭa's mind and with the help of the army supplied by his southern *nāyakas* he again marched to the Karṇāṭaka in May 1640. He was however obliged to return to Vellore in August, before rains set in.

But in April next year, Randaulā Khān with the support of Venkaṭa's nephew Śrīranga captured some places in Venkaṭa's empire, and came within twelve miles of Vellore. It was a trying period in the history of the empire, and the Nāyakas Tañjāvūr, Madhurai and Jiñji rallied to the emperor's standard. The combined forces resisted the Muslim advance to Vellore and saved the capital and the empire.[8] It is apparently this service rendered by the Nāyak of Madurai that is described in the ballad *Rāmappayyaṉ*

5. *Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission*, Vol. XVI, p. 51; also *Further Sources*, I, p. 345.
6. G. Sardesai, *New History of the Marathas*, Vol. I, p. 72.
7. Macleod, *op. cit.*, II, p. 173.
8. *Ibid*, p. 176.

Ammāṉai which deals with the achievements of Rāmappayya, the *daḷavāy* of Tirumalai Nāyaka. According to it Rāmappayya, while conducting his campaigns against the Setupati of Rāmanāthapuram, received a message from Tirumalai Nāyaka asking him to proceed north to help the emperor against the Muslims who had penetrated into the empire as far as Vellore. The Daḷavāy is said to have marched to Vellore and from there to Bangalore where after taking instructions from the emperor, he defeated the enemy for which he was duly honoured by the emperor.[9]

9. But Ramappayya's march to and success at Bangalore are not supported by other pieces of evidence. Probably he was one of those that fought on the side of the emperor in 1641 against the Bījāpuris on the outskirts of Vellore, and contributed much to the emperor's success.

REV. DR. KERR, THE UNKNOWN SOCIAL WORKER OF MADRAS IN THE XVIII CENTURY

BY

M. AROKIASWAMI

Rev. Dr. Richard Hall Kerr, a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (S. P. C. K.), who laboured in Madras at the close of the XVIII and in the beginning of the XIX century, is one of those little known figures of Madras history, who deserves better at the hands of the historian and the people of Madras. He worked ceaselessly in Madras for 15 years between 1792 and 1808 and during this period there was scarcely another ecclesiastic in the entire province of Madras, who excelled him in sincerity of purpose and earnestness in action. He came like all missionaries to preach the Gospel of his Lord and help the people in this country to rise from the trammels of poverty and the squalor of their surroundings. But he soon realised that the circumstances in which he found himself were anything but inspiring for the work of evangelization. In a report he submitted to the Board of Directors of the E. I. Company in London on the Syrian Christians of Malabar, he gives vent to his view in the following terms :[1]

> " We have, my Lord, been sadly defective in what we owed to God and man, since we have had a footing in this country, as well by departing most shamefully from our Christian profession ourselves, as in withholding those sources of moral perfection from the natives which true Christianity alone can establish ; and at the same time we have allowed the Romanists to steal into our territories to occupy the ground we have neglected to cultivate, and to bring an odium on our pure and honourable name as Christians."

Logically enough, Dr. Kerr gave up the path of evengelization and took to the work of social upliftment and it is about him as a social worker that the present paper proposes to deal. When Kerr came to India, he came to Bombay (1790); and was posted to superintend a Portuguese Eurasian school, which was then running in that place. But he soon got so tired of it that in two years he determined to return home. It was on his homeward journey

1. Home Series, miscellaneous, Vol. LIX.

that he came to Madras. As fortune would have it, Dr. Kerr fell ill in this place and the boat that took him there could not wait for him. As he lay languishing in Madras, he contacted a young civilian, Mr. Basil Cochrane, who put the idea of starting a school for the natives in Black Town into the head of Dr. Kerr. The idea was taken up, brought into reality and Dr. Kerr became one of the very first Europeans, who interested themselves in the affairs of Black Town. (1792)

Dr. Kerr soon attracted the attention of Sir Charles Oakley, the then Governor of Madras, who appointed him as military chaplain to Ellore, where the 4th Battalion of the Company Europeans were quartered (1793). Dr. Kerr liked this work and applied himself heart and soul to the task of building a church in that place. The work got so well under way, that he attracted the notice of the Governor again; and in 1796, he was appointed as chaplain of Fort St. George. Once again in Madras, he turned his attention to Black Town, and appealed to Government for help to build a church there. "He desired it as a work long and anxiously desired by many respectable people of the settlement and he pledged himself without any view to private emolument to volunteer as the clergyman of the intended chapel."[2]

The appeal met with complete success and that buoyed him up to further activity. It happened that in 1796, he was asked to be in additional charge of the Male asylum in Egmore, over which Dr. Bell, the father of what is known as the Madras system of Education, had till then presided.[3] This was indeed a great honour thrown on Dr. Kerr's shoulders and it was further increased by the appointment of James Cordiner, a graduate of Aberdeen, a young intellectual, for whom the E. I. Company[4] had high regard, as Headmaster of the Male Asylum to work under the supervision of Dr. Kerr.

Dr. Kerr was not satisfied with running the asylum as it was; he wished to blaze a new trail. In 1798, he persuaded the Directors to establish a printing press at the school with the two-fold idea of teaching the boys a profitable job and at the same time making

2. Consultations, 9th Sept., 1796; Penny, Church in Madras I, 416.

3. It was a famous school in those days, where the three R's, besides many useful trades were taught. Many of the students of this school became afterwards competent clerks of the Company at Madras and elsewhere.

4. The author of "Voyage to India" and "Description of Ceylon" which are quoted as authorities by writers on the subjects.

a business of it. He suggested to Government that they could help at enlarging it and get their own work done efficiently, confidentially and without any fees. Though the Government threw down the proposal foolishly at the first instance, Dr. Kerr proceeded with the scheme on his own; and soon the Government realising the wisdom of Kerr's plan, not only fell in with it, but actually agreed to give him one-third of the profit. Thus in 1800, the Government press, as we may call it, was first established within the compound of the Male Asylum at the Egmore Redoubt.

Early in the year 1801, Dr. Kerr opened up correspondence with a Calcutta chaplain, Rev. Claudius Buchanan, on a new scheme for relieving the distress of the European poor in the Madras Presidency and he decided to build up a Fund (by taking a part of the collections at Church during Easter, Christmas and Whitsuntide) for this purpose. He called for a meeting of the Vestry of Fort St. George, elected a special commitee form the Vestry committee, made the Governor the patron and thus started the Poor Fund of 1802, which supplied the nucleus for the Friend-in-need Society, which to-day stands on the Poonamallee High Road in Madras.

A native Poor Fund had already existed in Madras from 1696. It was placed in the hands of the Mayor and the Aldermen, who distributed it at the various choultries in the city every Monday morning.[5] In 1781, when a famine broke out in South India, a committee of 15 consisting of 10 Europeans, 1 British Eurasian, 1 Portuguese Eurasian, 1 Armenian and 2 Hindus was appointed by the the Fort St. George vestry to augment the Fund by applying for donations and Government help.[6] The famine lasted for two years during which period the Fund was very handy and useful. At the end of it the Committee resolved to transfer 20,000 pagodas to which the Native Poor Fund had accumulated to the Government in the name of the ministers and churchwardens of Fort St. George and thus the administration of the Fund fell in the hands of the Vestry and remained there till 1805.[7]

It was in this way that Dr. Kerr became connected with the Native Poor Fund. During the famine above mentioned the natives had been lodged and fed in a choultry near the present Washer-

5. Ft. St. George Consultations, 2nd Nov., 1696.
6. Ibid, 6th Aug., 1782.
7. Penny; op. cit., p. 430.

manpet generally called the Manigar Choultry[8] whose ownership was neither clear nor verified at the time. The real owner, however, soon asserted his claim and demanded rent for its use, going so far as to issue a lawyer's notice to the Vestry. Accordingly, 1700 pagodas in the first instance and 2192 pagodas in the second were paid as rent to the choultry by the Vestry in 1802 and 1804 respectively.[9] It now struck Dr. Kerr that instead of wasting money in paying out rent, the Vestry Committee could as well construct a Poor House in some place near the Fort having in it a workhouse and other amenities for the poor of either sex and of all descriptions and for this purpose the Native Poor Fund could be amalgamated with the Church Fund at St. Mary's, Fort St. George. Dr. Kerr also gave a scheme and estimate to the Vestry Committee, by which he showed that a sum of 6000 pagodas was necessary for the building and of 292 pagodas for its maintenance per month. He also sketched a detailed plan regarding the nature of work, clothes, meals, punishments, etc., that ought to be given to the inmates of the Poor House.

It was a bold scheme indeed that would have done untold good to the Native poor of Madras, if it had got under way. But as ill-luck would have it, it never materialised. In the first instance, the Governor, Lord William Bentinck, who was present at the Vestry meeting, staggerd at the financial implications of the proposal, notwithstanding Dr. Kerr's lucid analysis. Further, it was felt that the Native Poor Fund was to be issued in times of emergency like famine, pestilence, etc., and could not be issued for the building of a work-house. The question of incorporating it with the Church Fund was another difficulty. The greatest difficulty was that Dr. Kerr in the course of his feverish activity had made enemies of some of his countrymen in the settlement of Madras. One among them was Mr. Roebuck. He raked up the question of the Bridge Fund deposited by the executors of Petrus Uscan, the Armenian merchant, in the Vestry Committee for the care of the Marmalong bridge over the Adyar. Dr. Kerr unfortunately could not see the necessity of broadening that bridge, which some members of the Vestry were insisting on. Mr. Roebuck and his companions went so far as to request for legal opinion from the Advocate-General, who expressed that the Bridge Fund should be

8. Monegar (Choultry) being a free Tamil translation of the English alderman, in whose hands the relief of the poor lay at that time. The name, monegar choultry, that is in vogue to this day must have been given to the choultry during the famine.

9. Special Vestry Proceedings, 1802; Ft. St. George Consultations, 1804.

transferred to the Government and the Native Poor Fund to the proper authorities, to the Trustees, some of whom were still alive,[10] on the ground that being neither a corporation nor a body of statutable Trustees, the Vestry could not be recognised as competent to manage them. The suit in Chancery that followed regarding Uscan's money also settled the issue in the same way.[11]

Kerr's compassionate policy thus broke on the rock of prejudice and the blind eye of law that rarely knows any adjustment and accordingly we read the last words of the Proceedings of the Special Vestry which met on the 4th of December, 1805:

> "Henceforth the meetings of the Special Vestry will be discontinued.....It also becomes necessary that the management of the Native Poor Fund do revert to the original Committee."
>
> (Signed) R. H. Kerr, Senior Chaplain,
> E. Vaughan.

The very next year Dr. Kerr's health began to give way. He went to Mysore to recoup himself; but failing in it he resolved to sail for home. He arrived in Madras; but was dissuaded from going home by his friend, Claudius Buchanan, who told him that there was not one good clergyman worth the name in the whole Madras settlement at that time and that he should stay. But his death soon came in the April of 1808 in the Egmore school-house.

Thus ended the life and career of a remarkable Madras missioner, who came here at the turn of the XVIII century and lived through 15 years of strenuous life,[12] a large part of which was spent for the good of the poor in Madras. He had even planned to admit the native children in St. Mary's School, Fort St. George, then run solely for the European children. But he died before his object fructified.

10. Penny, op. cit., p. 550.
11. Penny, op. cit., p. 547.
12. During ten years before Dr. Kerr, the Vestry had only 6 meetings and during the first 10 years he spent in Madras there were 47 ordinary and 47 special meetings of the same Vestry.

THE CONCEPT OF ECONOMIC COMPLEMENTARITY *

BY

R. BALAKRISHNA

The multilateral system of trading is just a mechanism to operate the economic interdependence between nations. Its existence depends upon the pattern of internal economies and the willingness to accept mutual interdependence of nations. The nature of internal economies is largely governed by the resources and capacities of each nation. Since such resources vary considerably the pattern of economic development ought to vary in its turn if it is truly based on them. The observance of such a principle has the sanction of Economic Science on the ground of territorial division of labour and specialization. Of course the commodity needs of each nation, which cannot be fully satisfied by its own economies, have to be obtained from other nations. This would be the natural world pattern, tending to establish complementarity between nations. It is the economic motivation towards world unity.

DISTURBING FACTORS

Such a natural pattern is disturbed by nationalistic tendencies and fear of war. Economic nationalism was an unfortunate by-product of the political arrangement in Europe after the First World War. It led to industrialisation in all directions irrespective of the comparative cost doctrine. Self-sufficiency was openly avowed as a desirable expedient. Under-developed countries considered that economic progress could be achieved only through an imitation of the economic structure of advanced countries. The unfavourable terms of trade for primary producers during the thirties lent support to this notion. The threat of war carried the idea one step further. Substitute production to attain autarky was resorted to in spite of the extreme artificiality of the method. These tendencies have undermined the basic principle of economic complementarity between nations. With it the mechanism of multilateralism had also to disappear, as the foundation on which it could rest did not exist any longer.

* Note submitted to the Fiscal Commission (India) 1949-50.

The concept of complementarity is not with reference to any two particular countries. Such an understanding would reduce the orbit of trading relationships and would deny such countries the benefit of having the output of other countries of the world. The complementarity should be in terms of the needs and capacities of each nation in relation to a number of other nations of the world. The mechanism of multilateral trade enabled the participants to reach complementarity through a wide circle of trading members. It was not a difficult process so long as national specialisation was related to resources and faith in interdependence was maintained.

Unfortunately there was a break up of this delicate mechanism during the inter-war period. It was induced by the Great Depression. Local unemployment led to a restriction of trade through quotas, exchange control, etc. Adjustments through the normal price mechanism threatened to be long-drawn and uncertain. Various influences, including political power, began to exert themselves and the result was a grouping of nations and disintegration of world trade.

The second World War distorted national economies and gave an artificial stimulus to certain types of manufacture for which they were not suited. It was inevitable as an emergency measure, since the economically advanced countries were engaged in armament manufacture. Till recently the prevalence of the sellers' market maintained this position. But to foster it hereafter indefinitely through other artificial means is not correct. The unwinding of a war economy does not merely mean switching over to peace-time products, but it also means an establishment of a proper relationship between the nature of the economy and the resources of the nation. An essential problem in this context would be the manner of dealing with productive means created under the artificial conditions. The solution for it is to divert equipment for other uses unless they are too specific in character.

Measures for Revival

To reintroduce the old mechanism of multilateral trade the nations have to actively strive to erect once again the foundation on which it could rest. A mere desire for it without the readiness to make adjustments of national economies cannot yield any result. It cannot be achieved without a common agreement among the countries of the world. A group of nations should decide about the economy best suited for each of them and agree to take from the

others what they need. National plans of economic development ought to be realistic. False sense of patriotism and wrong notions of economic security are inimical to progress. Let each nation exploit the resources within it, but let it not attempt to make also the appliances needed for it if it is not fit to do them. For instance, the potential hydro-electric power should be generated, but it is futile to make also the machinery for it. Similarly, the mineral resources have to be exploited, but mechanical equipment for it may be obtained from wherever it is most economically made. It is the feeling of incompleteness in this scheme that excites emotionally people imbued by extreme nationalistic fervour. But such rounding-off is as wasteful as making an individual produce a whole pair of shoes instead of subjecting it to some 176 processes as in a modern American factory.

Our ideal should be to get the world economic pattern out of a synthesis of national patterns. Within each nation a synthesis of parts should yield the national pattern. This is the essence of Regional Planning within a nation. International Conferences should aim at such an ideal instead of prescribing and codifying measures which are out of context in the present situation. The Havana Charter, for instance, forgets all that has happened during these eventful years and prescribes a code of behaviour which could be observed only in its breach. The Charter would be ideal when economic complementarity is reestablished through other means.

Balance of Payments

A word about the existing disequilibrium in balance of payments would dispel any doubts about the practicability of our scheme. The present disequilibrium is partly fundamental and partly a short-period phenomenon. It is fundamental in so far as the U. S. A. has all the resources and the best equipment to produce all that it needs. Therefore the relationship with it could only be in the nature of a one-way traffic; capital equipment coming to other countries in the form of American loans. Even this will lose its exaggerated appearance when the short-period phenomenon of disequilibrium loses its ground. We can revert to it later. The short-period problem is to be attributed to the war devastation and other secular factors interfering with the restoration of internal economies. If they are helped to revive with an appropriate world economic policy their capacities would increase, thereby reducing proportionately the disequilibrium in balance of payments. With a larger flow of exports from them the relationship of each of the

nations with U. S. A. would acquire a better balance. American self-sufficiency does not mean a closed-door policy. A progressive country always finds a need for many things that the world could offer. Today the world is not offering her enough and not making the offer attractive. Either countries are misusing what they have or are not exploiting what they ought to.

Foreign Exchange weakness is nothing but a reflection of the instability of internal economies. Devaluation is only a frank recognition of such weakness. But it can by no means usher in a new economic order. The hope is that the respite that it would provide and its accelerating influence may help revival. But so long as fundamental maladjustments between nations and within nations continue to exist, simple tricks like devaluation cannot set the house in order. Our troubles are essentially structural in character.

There may be some political objections to the reordering of the world on the lines indicated. Obviously some countries in such a scheme would have to be essentially primary producers. Would it be to their advantage to continue to be so instead of developing the manufacturing side of their economy? The ultimate criterion of judgment is in terms of economic loss or gain. If the natural resources and the level of intellectual equipment warrant a particular form of economic activity there can be no economic loss in following it. It would be more uneconomic to produce something which a nation cannot do efficiently. Even self-sufficiency in food for a primary producer is not an axiom to be strictly followed. If India can grow jute which America cannot and exchange it for American foodgrains there is nothing economically faulty in the process. It does not mean, however, that primary producers ought not to indulge in manufacturing activities. It can be done just to process materials as far as it could be efficiently done. What is emphasised here is that it is uneconomic to go to the full length in every direction merely on political or sentimental grounds without adequate economic justification. For instance, the scheme for the manufacture of locomotives in West Bengal does not rest on sound economic considerations. The national ambition to develop a ship-building yard at Vizagapatam is equally unrealistic.

Of course certain economic objections may be levelled against such a policy. It may be argued, as it was done during the Great Depression, that the terms of trade would be against the countries

which continue to be essentially primary producers. Terms of trade are ultimately governed by the relative intensities of demand of the countries for the products that they require. If a proper balance is maintained by the countries of the world regarding the distribution of economic activities among themselves the terms of trade need not necessarily be always in favour of or against countries following a particular type of avocation. If during the depression the terms of trade were against agricultural countries it was on account of a surplus of agricultural produce seeking markets. Since the second World War agricultural produce is sought at high prices owing to economic dislocation, rise in population, change in dietetic habits, diversion of income to the poor class and other consequential changes resulting from a global consternation. So there is no logic of events driving the terms of trade always against the primary producers. Industrial raw materials like jute, cotton, oilseeds and minerals need not suffer always from unfavourable terms if the manufacturing countries of the world increase disproportionately and collectively demand large quantities of industrial raw materials from the primary producers. In other words, " terms of trade " is only a sensitive index of the manner in which countries are economically aligned and the volume in which their respective products emerge out of them.

A further argument in this context may be that the primary producers do not add as much economic value to their products as those that are specialising in secondary occupations. Consequently the primary producers would be compelled to accept a lower standard of living. This again is based on erroneous premises. The economic value of all endeavour depends upon the effective demand for it. If manufacturing technique is relatively rare the products of it would command a higher price in the international market. Otherwise it will lose the privileged position. Some countries endowed with sufficient capital and technical knowledge but denied natural resources may develop manufacturing technique. The higher price that comparable units of their products with ours may command is nothing but a measure of the value attached to technical skill and capital. It would certainly be higher as nature does not co-operate with them. When the world supply of capital and skill become abundant, products having nature's co-operation may command a premium. Obviously terms of trade cannot be the ultimate criterion of the choice of economic activity for each country. Besides standard of living is itself a relative conception. The mere adoption of secondary occupations cannot assure an equally higher standard among all such countries. The United Kingdom has by

no means the same standard of living as the United States of America, though both are advanced industrial countries.

The Threat of War

Of course there is one important rock on which the entire scheme as envisaged here may founder and that is the threat of war. The castles that have so far been built on the foundations of world economic unity may collapse as a house of cards with the blowing of war winds. Autarky as a defence against economic warfare will take the place of mutual interdependence of countries. The synthesis of national patterns would no longer be possible. The only possible answer to an objection like this is that we could either prepare world economy for peace or for war. We cannot economically prepare for war and live in it comfortably during peace. No objection can be raised against a reasonable provision in the budget for defence, but what is undesirable is to direct the entire economy towards an ultimate war. It is also impracticable to do it with perfect accuracy as it involves forecasts about allies and belligerents which might be falsified. However shrewd modern politicians may be they can never visualise the exact alignment of countries in a future war; otherwise they could synthesise economically parts on their side and make the world into two units permanently matched against each other. Though undesirable, even this may not be as bad as we imagine. But ideological differences which may hereafter be the basis of conflict may not conform to geographical and strategic conveniences of division. So it is always best that we prepared for peace and improvised for war. There is not much to emulate from the Nazi preparation for war. Ultimately it was improvisation which triumphed over preparation.

Regional Approach

To put the scheme into effect at once on a world basis may be difficult under the present circumstances. The world economic unity was disintegrated in parts and so logically they have to be integrated in parts. Consequently a regional approach has to be made for the restoration of world economic unity and stability. This is purely a transitional measure and a means to an end; the ideal being world economic synthesis. Any convenient basis may be chosen for the purpose of regional blocks. It could be the Commonwealth, the Sterling Area, Asia and the Far East, etc. However an important economic consideration in the delimitation of groups would be the mutual sustenance available within the group. People have to live in fair comfort even during the pro-

cess of evolution. Further the currency link is an important consideration in the present context. So as a workable proposition it is safe to recommend the sterling area as a suitable regional block for India. It would help continuance of international trade till the new pattern is evolved. In spite of these regional blocks there should be a world pattern as the ideal. Having that in view countries within each region should shape their economies. They should also bear in mind that all the individual economies have to be ultimately put together. The transitional aspect of the regional device should not be lost sight of in the process of evolution.

Any international monetary help either from countries like the United States of America or world institutions like the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should be given on condition that the internationally accepted economic pattern is being developed in the recipient countries. Otherwise vague concepts like economic development of undeveloped areas would spell disaster by encouraging the growth of incompatible economies. It is absolutely wrong to invite individual countries to present schemes of development, as it was done under the Marshall Aid. There should be some definite purpose behind these aids. It is only then that one could foresee the revival of economic balance within a measurable distance of time. For instance, the countries of Asia and the Far East have all been essentially primary producers, with the exception of Japan. Before the war most of them have had an export surplus adjusted against invisible imports. It reflects truly the internal economies of those countries. To consider them as undeveloped areas and offer them aid to develop on lines identical to those prevailing in Europe or America is suicidal to those that make the offer and also to world economic unity. The theory that industrialisation of backward areas will lead to greater international trade is no doubt true when correctly interpreted. If it is to be forced against all inefficiencies and bottlenecks there would only be uneconomic production. Development in consonance with available resources, technique and organizing ability is all that it ought to mean.

Finally it may be emphasised that it is not desirable to freeze any such scheme for ever. There ought to be ample provision for dynamic factors and mutable forces. Growth of population, capital formation, development of technique, etc., have all to be simultaneously fostered and watched with care. This condition would only make our scheme to acquire a dynamic character. Adjustments of internal economies and slight rearrangement

of the world pattern consequent upon such changes is not a formidable task.

All this discussion brings us back to the vital question of the role of tariffs in economic development. Tariffs will have a part to play until the free trade millennium is reached. That could happen only when perfect complementarity between the economies of the world is attained. Such an ideal in an imperfect world like ours may not be reached quickly; nay, may never be reached. There may still be countries having more or less identical patterns of economic development. A free international market, which might otherwise be desirable, may not be helpful in fostering national patterns. So tariff protection may be useful in such circumstances. They could be permitted if the national economies conform to the pattern laid down. The International Trade Organization could function as an appellate authority in deciding whether tariffs are justifiable in each case. That is a way of compelling recalcitrant countries to make the prescribed adjustments. The necessity for tariffs would be particularly great in the transitional period. Beyond this the tariffs have no part to play. According to the scheme enunciated here the entire outlook on national economic development will have to undergo a fundamental change. The objectives of the scheme cannot be attained by means of the tedious process of working through the price mechanism with the aid of tariffs.

THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION AND A CONCEPTION OF SECULAR STATE

BY

N. RAMA BHAT
Research Student

Secularism may be defined as an attempt to establish an autonomous sphere of knowledge purged of supernatural, fideistic presuppositions. It signifies an exclusive attention to the affairs of this life. A secularist is one who theoretically rejects every form of religious faith and worship. Also, he is one who believes that education and other matters should be conducted without the introduction of a religious element.

The state is a legal association, or a juridical organisation. Its membership is a legal fact. It is "a territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming, within its allotted physical area, a supremacy over all other institutions".[1] It is "a fellowship of men aiming at the enrichment of the common life. It is an association like others: churches, trade unions and the rest. It differs from them in that membership is compulsory upon all that live within its territorial ambit, and that it can, in the last resort, enforce its obligations upon its subjects. But its moral character is no different from that of any other association. It exacts loyalty upon the same grim condition that a man exacts loyalty from his friends. It is judged by what it offers to its members in terms of the things they deem to be good".[2] If the state exists to make life possible it continues to make good life possible; its activity must be moulded by "the things they deem good". Good life demands an articulate knowledge and experience. It demands the existence of those social conditions which are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness. Liberty "implies power to expand, the choice by the individual of his own way of life without imposed prohibitions from without. Men cannot, as Rousseau claimed, be forced into freedom. They do not, as Hegel

1. Laski, H. J., *A Grammar of Politics*, London, 1948 Ed., p. 21.
2. *Ibid*, p. 37.

insisted, find their liberty in obedience to the law. They are free when the rules under which they live leave them without a sense of frustration in realms they deem significant. They are unfree whenever the rules to which they have to conform compel them to conduct which they dislike and resent ".[3] It demands the freedom of thought, of expression, of assembly, of faith and worship. These elementary freedoms cannot be real unless the citizens are secured social, economic and political justice, and, the equality of status and opportunity.

Whether a State is secular or not turns on its relationship with the church, church in a generic sense. Roughly, the possibilities are four: identity, affiliation, separation and suppression. The last possibility, suppression, is a denial of those conditions that are necessary for human happiness. Freedom of belief is nothing but an aspect of freedom of mind. To deny freedom of mind is to deny the individual his moral personality. Suppression of opinion, because it is false in the opinion of those in authority, is an illegitimate exercise of power. John Stuart Mill's case for freedom of thought and expression is based on four grounds: "First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth, and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth, unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself, will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct: the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground and preventing growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience ".[4] The denial of freedom of mind thwarts human pro-

3. Laski, H. J., *Liberty in the Modern State*, London, 1948 Ed., p. 48.
4. Mill, J. S., *On Liberty*, London, (Watts & Co.), 1945, pp. 63-64.

gress. "The heresies we may suppress to-day are the orthodoxies of to-morrow. New truth begins always in a minority of one: it must be some one's perception before it becomes a general perception. The world gains nothing from a refusal to entertain the possibility that a new idea may be true".[5] The great American Judge, Holmes, valued greatly "free trade in ideas". For him "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market".[6]

Freedom of thought and expression, it needs emphasizing, is not based on the validity of particular thought. Men of religion, accepting their own as the only repository of truth, have not hesitated to deny others the equal right. "Intolerance", says Ruggiero, "is of the essence of every church, an immediate consequence of its faith that it possesses the only effective means for the salvation of the soul".[7] When there is an identity of state and church the intolerance of men of religion is reinforced by legal sanction. It was so when Rome adopted Christianity as its official religion in the fourth century. "Augustine", says Ruggiero,[8] "a supporter of religious liberty, as long as heretics enjoyed a position of hegemony in Africa, bent all of his energies thereafter to the consolidation of orthodoxy. He developed the definitive doctrinal foundations for all subsequent persecutions in the name of Christianity. As summarized by Bluntschli, the Augustinian doctrine holds that when error prevails it is right to invoke liberty of conscience: but when on the contrary, the truth predominates, it is just to use coercion." With this identity of church and State, ecclesiastical law was the basis of all law. Ecclesiastical courts had the long arm of the civil power as a sanction against disobedience or recalcitrance. In Ancient India, it was the duty of the King to enforce Dharma. Law was not a norm of conduct enunciated by the King, but, Dharma as interpreted by wise men. The states were not secular.[9] The duties and rights of citizenship varied from caste to caste. In the West, the differentiation of church from state was quickened by

5. Laski, H. J., *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98.

6. *Abrams* v. *United States,* 250 U. S. 630, 40 Sup. Ct. at 22. Cited in Laski, H. J., *Studies in Law and Politics*, London, 1932, p. 159.

7. Ruggiero, G. D., Religious Freedom, *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, London, 1934, Vol. XIII, p. 239.

8. *Ibid*, p. 241.

9. Cf. Venkatarangaiya, M., *Draft Constitution of India*, Bombay, 1948. Chap. IV; Anjaria, J. J., *The Nature and Grounds of Political Obligation in The Hindu State,* Bombay, 1935; Ramamoorthy, Pratapagiri, *The Problem of the Indian Polity,* Bombay, 1935.

the sharp sectarian differences. In the long struggle for freedom of thought, there came about a decline, in power and prestige, of Ecclesiastical law and courts, and, the rise of civil law and courts. One milestone in Britain was the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, revising the decision of the Ecclesiastical courts, involving the question as to what theological doctrines were binding on a clergyman. The clergyman was given a liberty of opinion that Archbishops of Canterbury and York would not allow. The decision, no doubt naturally, prompted an epitaph on Lord Westbury (Lord Chancellor) : "Towards the close of his earthly career he dismissed Hell with cost and took away from Orthodox members of the Church of England their last hope of everlasting damnation".[10]

After spells of suppression, and patronage of particular sects, the English worked out a compromise which may be called affiliation. There is an Established Church: but its writ runs through England only while the government has jurisdiction over Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Though the days of persecution are over, the fact of an established church detracts from religious liberty. For liberty and equality are twin forces acting and interacting on each other in the evolution of democracy. The one needs balancing with the other. Dr. Thomson says in his *Equality*,[11] "Democracy carried with it an impetus to extend democratic principles from the sphere of law and politics into the spheres of religious, economic and social life. These tendencies, in their diverse ways prepared the way for 'the century of the common man'. The ideals of equality and liberty, in constant interaction, were the very fibre of this development: and in their modern manifestations they must be considered as the climax of a long historical process and therefore as comprehensible only in relation to this continuous historical process. To regard egalitarianism, thus understood, as an incompatible intrusion into democratic ideals and practices, the product of occasional utopian cranks or latter-day socialists, is to misinterpret the whole history of modern democracy". The fact of an established church carries with it a preferance for that church: the state cannot be neutral if it sponsors one. The members of the Aglican Church enjoy advantages, psychological and other, rather than strictly legal, over those of other sects. As Laski observes,[12] "It does not seem, however, to

10. Bury, J. B., *A History of Freedom of Thought*, London, 1944 Ed., p. 206.

11. Thomson, D., *Equality*, London, 1949, p. 42.

12. Laski, H. J., *Grammar*, p. 119.

be realised that religious toleration cannot be fully attained so long as a State maintains special relations with a given church. For, in that case whatever the law. there is bound to be a special prestige for those who belong to the official connection. For the state to stamp with its approval some special religious doctrine is to offer privilege to that doctrine even if the privilege does not assume institutional form. If the Church of England were separated from the State, Anglican theology could not maintain itself at Oxford and Cambridge against scientific theology. If the Church of England were separated from the State, a single form of religious belief would not hold a privileged position in the educational system of the community. A State Church is bound to receive privileges in some shape or form; and no citizen enjoys genuine freedom of religious conviction until the State is indifferent to every form of religious outlook from Atheism to Zoroastrianism". The affiliation of church to state hampers both the state and the church. The latter is tied down to certain theological doctrines which all the citizens may not only not share but some even abhor. The former becomes a plaything of political factors.[13]

The separation of church from state is the path chosen by the American people. Though the early colonists fled Europe on account of religious persecution, they did not hesitate to persecute sects other than their own, none the less. The position is described by Mr. Justice Black in his opinion for the Supreme Court in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*.[14]

"A large proportion of the early settlers of this country came from Europe to escape the bondage of laws which compelled them to support and attend Government-favoured churches. The centuries immediately before and contemporaneous with the colonization of America had been filled with turmoil, civil strife and persecutions generated in large part by established sects determined to maintain their absolute political and religious supremacy. With the power of government supporting them, at various times and places, Catholics had persecuted Protestants, Protestants had persecuted Catholics, Protestant sect had persecuted other Protestant sects, Catholics of one shade of belief had persecuted Catholics of another shade of belief and all of these had from time to time persecuted

13. Cf. Hamerton, cited in Cohen, C., *A Grammar of Free-Thought*, London, 1921, p. 39.

14. (1940) 330 U. S. 1, cited in Ramaswamy, M., *The United States of America: A Secular State*, Bangalore, 1949, pp. 3-4; see also pp. 4-8.

Jews. In efforts to force loyalty to whatever religious group happened to be on top and in league with the government of a particular time and place, men and women had been fined, cast in jail, cruelly tortured, and killed. Among the offences for which these punishments had been inflicted were such things as speaking disrespectfully of the views of ministers of government-established churches, non-attendance at those churches, expressions of non-belief in their doctrines, and failure to pay taxes and tithes to support them. These practices of the old world were transplanted to and began to thrive in the soil of the new America. The very charters granted by the English Crown to the individuals and companies designated to make the laws which would control the destinies of the colonials, authorized these individuals and companies to erect religious establishments which all, whether believers or non-believers, would be required to support and attend. An exercise of this authority was accompanied by a repetition of many of the old-world practices and persecutions. Catholics found themselves bounded and proscribed because of their faith, Quakers who followed their conscience went to jail, Baptists were peculiarly obnoxious to certain dominant Protestant sects: men and women of varied faiths who happened to be in a minority in a particular locality were persecuted because they steadfastly persisted in worshipping God only as their own conscience dictated. And all of these dissenters were compelled to pay tithes and taxes to support government-sponsored churches whose ministers preached inflammatory sermons designed to strengthen and consolidate the established faith by generating a burning hatred against dissenters."

Not even all men of religion considered persecution of other sects an aid to religion. There was a movement for religious freedom. Sponsored by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, it succeeded in writing into the constitutional fabric the First Amendment which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof: or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press: or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances". Madison and Jefferson believed that "religion can exist free and flourish peaceably only when wholly independent of civil interference, whether in the form of support or restriction".[15] Jefferson said, in an address to a Baptist association:[16]

15. *Cornell Law Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIII, 1947, p. 123; Cf. also *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. LVII, pp. 114-122.

16. Cited in Ramaswamy, M., *op. cit.*, p. 37.

"Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between Church and State". This Wall of separation is the First Amendment. The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means: "Neither a State nor a Federal Government can set up a Church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious belief or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practise religion. Neither a State nor a Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organisations or groups and *vice versa*. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and state' ".[17] The wall of separation prohibits aid to parochial educational institutions. In the *McCollum* case, use of tax-supported school buildings for religious instruction and the released time arrangement were considered a violation of the First Amendment.[18]

The Indian Constitution guarantees to all equally the freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practise and propagate religion subject to public order, morality and health. The latter reservation is not without a parallel in the constitutional law of America.[19] But the Indian State is not prevented from regulating any economic, financial, political or other activity which may be associated with religious practice. The religious minorities are assured of the right to establish educational institutions. Religious instruction is not allowed in educational institutions organised and maintained wholly by the state. In institutions recognised and

93189

17. Cited in Ramaswamy, M., *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

18. *Yale L. J.*, Cf. also Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, 1[illegible] Ed., Vol. II, p. 771.

19. Corwin, Edward S., *The Constitution*, Princeton, 1946 Ed., pp. 149-151.

aided by the state, the consent of the student, or of his parent if a minor, is the prescribed condition precedent to religious instruction. Though the school of thought that denies freedom of conscience finds such consent unnecessary and irksome, the case for such consent is very strong in the context of a plurality of faiths and the anxiety of men of faith to insulate the young against the blasts of rational and comparative criticism.[20]

The article 27 reads: "No person may be compelled to pay any taxes, the proceeds of which are specifically appropriated in payment of expenses for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religion or religious denomination." This is a constitutional principle of fundamental importance. It concedes in substance the prohibition of establishment of religion.

The framers of the Indian Constitution, in their meticulous care for detail, and, anxiety to foresee every contingency, have indulged in some legalistic quibbling. The article on religious instruction in schools and the one that the State shall not discriminate against any educational institution, in the matter of aid, on the basis of religion only, indicate that religious instruction is allowed in state-aided schools. But the article regarding taxes (cited above), as becomes a secular state, does not allow the state to collect taxes for purposes of propagation of religion. Aid to parochial schools giving religious instruction is an aid to propagation of religion. The conflict between prohibition of aid to propagation of religion, and, implied permission of aid to parochial schools can be resolved only by a judicial philosophy that gives some rights a preferred place in the scheme of constitutional values. The American Supreme Court,[21] in recent years, has developed this judicial doctrine with respect to civil liberties. Here three principles are fused. They are (a) the four liberties protected by the First Amendment are so indispensable to the democratic process and to the preservation of freedom that they occupy a preferred place, are of more fundamental importance than the other provisions of the Constitution; (b) that freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly are so vitally important that the usual presumption of constitutionality will not attach to a statute which on its

20. Bury, J. B., *op. cit.*, pp. 209 *et. seq.* regarding Papel Syllabus of Errors; Beard, C. A. and M. R., *The American Spirit*, New York, 1942, pp. 511-522.

21. Cushman, Robert E., Civil Liberties, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. XLII, pp. 43-44.

face appears to abridge them, i.e., the statute will be presumed to be unconstitutional; (c) presumption of unconstitutionality can be rebutted only by convincing the court that a restriction on any one of the civil liberties is justified by the existence of a "clear and present danger". Similarly, the constitutional values embodied in our articles are of different orders of importance. A secular democratic state must set greater store by articles 26 and 27 than by the aid to sectarian schools contemplated in articles 28 and 30.

The case against aid to sectarian schools does not rest entirely on practical expediency in a country of many faiths with a record of none too cordial relations between them in the recent past. Sectarian education tuned to religious purposes warps objective truth so necessary in education. Laski says, "I sat as an appointed member of the Education Committee of the London County Council. I was presented there with a requisitory, drawn up by a Catholic body, against the use of certain books on the ground that they contain untrue statements about questions like the Reformation, in which Catholics are particularly interested. But I have not observed in the same Catholic body a desire only to use those text books in their own denominational schools which Protestants are prepared to accept as a true picture of the Reformation".[22] The totalitarian religions that seek to make *complete communities* of men belonging to particular faiths are detrimental to democratic progress.[23] Also, such tendencies hinder the fraternity and the unity of the nation that is enunciated in our preamble.

It is considered, in some quarters, not the province of a secular state to amend or codify the personal laws of the Hindus or of Muslims. That the personal laws are based on religions is admitted on all hands. Why should civil laws be based on the religions? If two persons, a Hindu and a Muslim, commit a crime, say a murder, under identical conditions, they are not treated differently. The state should not make distinctions based on religion in the laws of contract or of inheritance. A uniform civil code, the only logical attitude for a secular state, is declared to be an objective towards which the state policy should be directed (art: 44). That is a mandate to the authorities.

22. Laski, *Liberty*, p. 103; Cf. also the controversy about attempts to "correct" history by the Westminster Catholic Federation with G. G. Coulton, cited in Amphlett Micklewright, *Roman Catholic Schools and Democratic Rights*, London, 1944, Sec. II.

23. Cf. Barker, Ernest, *Essays on Government*, London, 1946, pp. 261-264.

The constitution does not carry a specific prohibition of the establishment of religion as the American does. Yet art: 27 may be considered as the basis of the secular state. The guarantees of religious freedom are not only the articles specifically granting rights to profess, practise and propagate religion but also the one that proceeds of taxes shall not be applied to religious purposes. The directive principle regarding cow-protection may be taken exception to. It is an improper attempt on the part of some people to write into the Constitution their own religious attitude. If the Constitution is worked in the spirit of art: 27 and the courts uphold that article as the bedrock of religious freedom, an article with a primacy over other provisions in the Constitution, the Indian State can be a secular democratic state, as secular as the Jeffersonian wall has made the American constitutional experiment.

BOOK REVIEWS

Sharing and Fixed Tenancy Systems. By V. V. Sayana. Business Week Press, Madras. pp. 137. Price Rs. 3/-.

This monograph on Sharing and Fixed Tenancy Systems describes in some detail the chief features of the three systems of tenancy prevalent in the Andhra area of the Province of Madras, the *Palu* system or share tenancy, the *Makta* system or fixed rent in kind and the *Cist* system or the fixed rent in money. After examining the prevalence of the different systems in some of the Provinces of the Indian Union and in some foreign countries, such as, U.S.A., France, Italy, China and Pakistan in the introductory chapter, the author goes on, in the five chapters which follow, to survey the salient features of the three systems as they prevail in the Andhra area and the Ceded Districts. Under share tenancy the different practices which obtain in different regions under dry, wet and garden cultivation are described and an attempt is made to relate the rates of produce-sharing with the contributions made by landlord and tenant respectively to farming operations. The data presented are stated to be collected by the author himself through personal investigations. Under fixed rent systems also much the same method is followed and the factual situation is vividly depicted.

In the last of the five chapters the effects of the different tenancy systems on the incomes of landlords and tenants, on the efficiency of farming operations, on the improvement and productivity of land, etc., are analysed. The main conclusion that the author draws from this study is that 'it is doubtful whether any remarkable divergence is noticeable in the relative efficiency of cultivation under the fixed and sharing systems in the province'.

In the final chapter of the monograph the author gives a summary of conclusions and recommendations. There he examines the recommendations made by the President's Committee on Farm Tenancy in the U.S.A., and asserts that with a few additional provisions relating to rents and their remission and period of leases, those recommendations, if implemented in this country, would go a long way to improve tenancy conditions and regulate landlord-tenant relationship. A few guiding principles for reforming the three systems are then suggested, and finally the author recommends share-farming as an ideal tenancy but reorganized so as to

convert it into a 'system of joint farming under a veritable co-partnership between the landlord and the tenant'. Under this system landlords and tenants will pool their resources of manure, operating equipment and labour, bear in equal proportions all the expenses of cultivation and share the produce equally.

In appendices attached to the book, copies of some lease deeds are given and also statements relating to the incomes of landlords and tenants under different tenancy patterns. There is a glossary also at the end. The Foreword is written by Sir S. V. Ramamurthy.

In small compass the author has presented all the data he has collected relating to tenancy systems and the conclusions he has drawn from a study of them. But one regrets that his investigations could not be extended to the other parts of the province, where also the three systems exist. Such a fuller investigation alone would have served as legitimate basis for the generalizations he makes regarding the province as a whole.

C. W. B. Z.

Some Aspects of Education in Ancient India by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja—Published by the Adyar Library, Madras, 1950. Price Rs. 2-8-0.

This small book under review represents two lectures delivered by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja under the Dewan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao Endowment in the University of Madras. In the course of the first lecture the author describes the general aspects of the educational system in ancient India and says that education had a continuous history even from the days of the Samhitas and the practice of *svādhyāyādhyayana* (study of what has been prescribed for one's own study) was current since then. He thinks that the *upanayana* marked only the start of the Vedic study, but it was not the first start of the education of a boy, for actually the boy's initiation into the arts of reading and writing was performed after his *cūḍākarma* and before his *upanayana*. According to him education of a high standard was an obligatory equipment for the exercise of full privileges in society and anyone who failed to acquire it could not have any social status.

In the course of his second lecture Dr. Kunhan Raja examines at length various views on the purpose of education and says that

though it was to enable a man to acquire ability to perform *yāgas* and contemplate on the Supreme Truth, its main purpose was to enable him to become a worthy citizen of a civilized state, for literature, arts, religion and philosophy were all integral parts of that civic life. He distinguishes different stages in the education of a youth which, in his opinion has close relation to the general educational set up in modern times. They were the primary stage before initiation, the regular study in the household of the teacher after the ceremonial initiation, and later very specialized study of certain specific problems for which there was no initiation. The highest stage was marked by the meetings of Academies and Conferences where scholars assembled and discussed various problems. The book is a welcome addition to the existing literature on the subject.

T. V. MAHALINGAM.

Edicts of Asoka (Priyadarsin), with an English translation by G. Srinivasa Murti and A. N. Krishna Aiyangar and an Introduction by K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar — Published by the Adyar Library, Madras (1950). Price: Board, Rs. 2/-, Cloth, Rs. 3/-.

The inscriptions or the Edicts of Asoka are unique in the annals of epigraphy considered from any point of view, their form, objective, content or originality. They are not after all many, for excluding the repetitions which occur very frequently there are about 35 inscriptions containing not more than 5,000 words. But their value to the historian is great for they enable him to have an insight into the personality of the great emperor, though Prof. Charpentier has doubted if Asoka " has laid open to us or has concealed the greater part of his own personality ". Unlike historical records of a similar nature, the aim of Asoka's edicts is not to glorify the author or give an account of his achievements as a king, but to appeal to his contemporaries and also to posterity to follow great moral truths.

The study of Asokan epigraphy is more than a century old and there is a large volume of literature on it. But a popular and handy edition of the edicts of the emperor in their original form with a translation has been a need and it is in the fitness of things that the Adyar Library has brought out a new edition of them. The scheme adopted in the work is as follows: On the left side the text is presented with the corresponding transliterated text of

the edicts in English; on the right side, the Sanskrit *chāya* and the English translation are presented. All the edicts are brought under the three heads, Rock Edicts, Pillar Edicts, and Cave Edicts. Much care has been taken by the Editors to give a good and readable translation of the edicts.

The value of the publication is greatly enhanced by the learned and thought-provoking introduction contributed by the distinguished scholar, Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. He examines the content and character of the edicts in a detailed way in the light of the Dharmasastra teachings and finds a remarkable similarity between them. He explains how the views of Asoka on the value of rites and ceremonies performed 'on occasions of illness' and rites at marriages, births and before journeys are undertaken and rites done by mothers on behalf of children which are not futile but bear small fruit are reflected in the Mimamsa concept of dharma act. "The distinction made by Asoka is that between an act for a desired end termed in dharmasastra as *kamyaphala* and a moral or unselfish act done without expectation of a desired benefit (*nishkamyakarma*)." He thinks that the view that Asoka condemned the slaughter of animals from Buddhist affinity is not correct. "Asoka's conception of Dharma is virtually a reproduction of Mimamsa-Vaiśeṣika definition of the term, i.e., that which produces an invisible quality of the soul termed *apūrva* which causes heavenly bliss and leads to final emancipation." He questions the correctness of the interpretation of the term *dharma* as the Buddhist term *dhamma* for Asoka's *dharma* was only the Brahmanic concept, and dharmavijaya really meant conquest made after following proper usages of war. Asoka's religious attitude was a tolerant one and his missionary activities were calculated to spread ethical principles and humane activities, in short to emphasise the moral basis of all religions. But with regard to the religion of the emperor, the Professor thinks that "he became and remained a Buddhist but of a tolerant and unexclusive type". He is not, however, inclined to believe in the correctness of the accounts contained in the Ceylonese and other legends regarding the delay in the coronation of Asoka. He thinks that the coronation must have taken place shortly after the pollution period after Bindusara's death, and therefore suggests that dates given for the events in the reign of Asoka have to be put back by about four years. This is worth serious consideration by students of Ancient Indian History.

T. V. MAHALINGAM.

Supplement to the Madras University Journal

THE RT. HON'BLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRIAR
ENDOWMENT LECTURES

DEMOCRACY IN CONTEMPORARY INDIA

BY

DR. C. R. REDDY, M.A. (CANTAB.), D.LITT.
Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University

The Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar Endowment Lectures

DEMOCRACY IN CONTEMPORARY INDIA

BY

DR. C. R. REDDY, M.A. (CANTAB.), D.LITT.

Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University

LECTURE I

TUESDAY, 30TH AUGUST 1949 — 5-30 P.M.

Dr. Sir A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, Vice-Chancellor, University of Madras, introducing the lecturer said :

I do not propose to commit the indiscretion of introducing the distinguished lecturer of this evening to an audience anywhere in India or, for the matter of that outside India. But I do wish to appropriate to myself a word of congratulation from you in that I have been able, by patience and perseverence, at last to see that Dr. Reddy appears on this platform to dliver the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar Endowment Lecture. For some months past, I have been at it and every letter that I received from him suggesting a postponement met with such a ready response that I am afraid my esteemed friend found it impossible to get rid of my importunities. It is a great honour to us that he has consented to deliver the lecture. With his characteristic ability, he has chosen a subject of entrancing interest at the present time 'Democracy in Contemporary India'. I can think of nobody better fitted than Dr. Reddy by virtue of his great knowledge of political affairs as well as by his knowledge of contemporary events and the part that he has played — some part, little or big it is for posterity to say — in the interpretation of politics to contemporary India. I feel that there can be no doubt whatsoever that we could not have had a better person to give us a talk on a subject of such entrancing interest. He has been, as you are doubtless aware, a Member of the old Legislative Council of the Montford days, he has been a Member of the Legislative Council of the Provincial Autonomy days, and I regret that he is not there with me

in the present Legislative Council to share what little of misfortune or fortune we may have. I am glad that his experience has been diversified in all spheres of legislative activity. He is also an academician and a politician whose politics are whetted by practical experience in the Legislature. I am sure you have come to listen to him and not to me. Therefore, without further ado, I request Dr. Reddy to deliver the lecture.

* * * *

I thank my friend, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, for the very cordial terms in which he introduced me to this distinguished audience. He started by saying that he would not be guilty of an indiscretion. Really, it is I that have been guilty of indiscretion. For I have chosen a subject of living interest, importance and concern. Subjects that are real, concrete, immediate, and which affect current thoughts and opinions are, naturally and very properly, open to controversy. They invite controversy. They are fields of contentious opinion, which may involve heavy fighting and not merely light skirmishing. On such subjects people are more ready to disagree than to agree.

Ours is a University function. I have to maintain the level and objectivity of an academic discourse. It must be a lecture, not a public speech; and it must be sufficiently dull to deserve academic distinction. I must deal scientifically with facts, their possible explanations and analysis, and draw guarded inferences.

At the very thresh-hold, we meet with this difficulty: Can we disentangle facts from impressions in politics? A widespread impression is about the same as public opinion. On a large scale it becomes effective. It may lack reason and reality, but it may not lack force. That is the *raison d'être* of propaganda. But the objective world is not the slave of subjective opinions. If the facts are not sufficiently known or appreciated, policies based on groundless opinion become ineffective in history, however effective they might be at the ballot box. It is difficult in this subject to be entirely objective. Subjective elements intrude and they cannot be kept out completely. Furthermore, that which is real and of living interest changes with time. It has to adjust itself to changing condi-

tions ; otherwise it would become antiquity and cease to be history. Conditions keep changing whether we like it or not. The living interest of today was not the living interest of yesterday ; and it may not be the living interest of tomorrow. No doubt events are bound, each to each, by subtle connections, but they change. We are creatures of time. Time changes. It is an ever-flowing stream. In the abstract, there are universals like mathematical propositions which are timeless and do not change ; which is the reason why it is more easy to agree on mathematical propositions than in politics, where even with the greatest possible charity and sincerity of judgment, we find ourselves at loggerheads with each other.

By way of illustration of the principle that the real changes, I may mention, with due nervousness, our great Party, the Congress. Has it not changed ? Is it today in its ideals, theories, conduct and practices what it was some four years ago ? I need not go into the question in what directions it has changed. I may have to take it up later. The simple point is : Has it not changed ? But is change in itself wrong ? Can a living organism fail to change ? In politics we sometimes decry change as inconsistency, even when the change is well grounded. History judges by results, though processes are not negligible. Even the most virtuous processes, if they lead to rack and ruin, will not be put by history on the credit side of statesmanship. Sometimes processes, which may not be ethically perfect but which lead to success, are counted on the credit side at least politically. In some measure the good determines the right. So in dealing with change the question to be asked is not whether the guilt of inconsistency could be brought home but whether the change is justified by historical processes and events, and whether it has done, on the whole, more good, or, on the whole, more evil. In human life, whatever the professions and pretensions, we do not find the absolute good and the perfectly true. It is always a mixture of light and shade, and varying degrees of grey with white and black mingled. We cannot, therefore, be dogmatic in our judgments. We have to be guarded and we must severely limit the range and degree of absoluteness in our opinions.

When I say History judges by results, we must ask : By what results — short-range results or long-range results ? That which

is a success now may prove to be a failure in the years to come and the ground of ultimate ruin. What look like desperate ventures today might be the stepping stones to striking successes tomorrow. That is why history is always re-written, written from the point of view of the latest results and contemporary feelings. The present reveals the past in its own changing lights and shadows and colours; and perhaps obscures the future by its own shadows.

Look at the way Empires have arisen. Could anybody have foreseen that the English who came here as traders, would remain on as Emperors? Their short-range object, due to deliberate motive and intention, was trade; the long-range result was Empire. Look also at the way Empires have fallen or dissolved. England wins the most complete victory possible in the greatest war that the world has so far known; on the morrow of her triumph over her enemies in the East and in the West, she quits India, Burma and Ceylon; and, as it were, liquidates her Empire. An Empire won through victories is relinquished after victories. What a paradox!

Godkin, a political thinker of almost classical eminence in my student days, wrote a couple of books on the Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy and of History. Here is an illustration. In the American Constitution, the President was to have been elected by some wise and seasoned representatives forming an Electoral College. Washington, Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and other Fathers of the Constitution, thought it dangerous to allow the people, as a whole, to elect the President directly. The people were to elect a limited number of wise, patriotic, honest persons who would meet in an electoral college and choose the President. But what has happened? The electoral college has become a dummy, and the President is in effect directly elected by the people. Even before the college meets, the defeated candidate congratulates the victor. So also with reference to indirect election to the Senate instituted by the Fathers in the original Constitution. Legislators of the States were to have elected the Senators of the Congress, but now they are elected directly by the voters. Time marches; and changes occur in two ways, firstly, by regular amendments to the Constitution, and secondly, by convention. Especially in Anglo-Saxon countries in which legalistic conservatism is the predominant senti-

ment, practice changes through custom, convention and the multitude of understandings which make their politics a fine art instead of a mechanism.

I think I have made it clear that dogmatic assertions are hardly possible in the subject with which we are dealing. But, while as a man of the University I must caution against dogmatism, absolute judgments, and whatever savours of infallibility, I must also recognise that there is a place in politics for dogmatism, for assertiveness and for the pose of infallibility. In fact men of action have to proceed on this basis in order to win over the people to their side. You have to promise a new heaven on earth if you want to get their votes. Not only that; but you have to assert that you are the only man who could bring that about.

The psychology of action is rather different from that of academic thought, analysis and reflection. It cannot allow its conscience to be sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought. There is room in this wide and varied world of politics for everybody — for men of action, for dogmatists, for the people who pose, for the people who oppose, and all shapes, shades and varieties.

So far I have been dealing only with the introduction to my subject so as to guard myself from possible motives of partisanship. We shall try to make it possible for men of all Parties and of no Parties and even the Party, so evident in India, of Independents that are independent of each other, to feel that for the time being, at any rate, they are in a University and listening to an academic discourse. I have no opinions to offer, no judgments to pronounce and no prescriptions for curing the ills of India and of mankind. My treatment is naturalistic; to state facts in so far as I could disentangle them from opinions and impressions; and give explanations; and draw tentative or probable inferences and forecast, with due reserve and an acute sense of fallibility, the tendencies of the future.

The scope of the subject is very wide. If it was only a public speech, a political address, it would be limited. I would be dealing, if I were a partisan of the Congress, with all its virtues, suppressing

for the moment its vices; and if I was an opponent of the Congress like Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, I would narrate all its vices, forgetting all its virtues; and furthermore, in a political speech, while I condemned other Parties, I would by implication and insinuation claim for myself all the virtues which I found lacking in them. People forget that the Congress, which is today criticised for this or that moral delinquency, itself at one time charged the Justice Party with similar delinquencies; but we are children of the same mother and of the same heredity. So, perhaps we are not very different from each other in character, however much we may differ in ideas. And when we come to power, we may be guilty of the very vices which we shuddered at when the other fellows were in power. Lord Acton's dictum that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely" is a great half-truth. I have always disputed that proposition. If power corrupts inevitably, always and without exception, then, since we all seek power, are we to be put down as wicked persons? It is obvious that without power we cannot defend our country or conserve our civilisation and culture. The utmost we can say is: Power is fraught with temptations; but so are all the other grand achievements of life. It is the small men grovelling on the ground that will not fall. The higher we rise, the greater the risk of a fall. Shall we, therefore, refuse to rise? I do not believe in the milksop ethics which condemns pursuit of power as a wrong in itself. Power as an end in itself is wrong. But it is not wrong as a condition of promoting human good by humanitarian service, and of exalting the greatness of a country by securing for it a higher place amongst the Nations.

In any exhaustive treatment of the subject, we must include the naturalistic point of view also. We must take a survey of the origin, growth and decay of democratic institutions in India, granting that there has been decay; and under what conditions they have been brought into existence again; and in what forms and shapes; and what constitutional arrangements we are making; how they have been organized; how far they have grown from the soil and to what extent they have been imported from abroad and transplanted. Then, we have to deal with the actual functioning of democracy, and of its organs like the judiciary, the legislature, the executive; and the Defence Services. The same organs may

function differently amongst different people. All the Parliaments of the world are not functioning alike, even when they closely resemble each other in organization. Since representative democracy cannot, as it appears to most people, function without Parties, we have to ask: How are Parties formed? How do they function? What is the relation between Party and the Cabinet and the Legislature; and between the Party and the Legislature? Is parliamentary democracy the only form of democracy possible? True, direct democracy of the type that prevailed in the Greek City States is impossible. But can there not be other forms of democracy, as Karl Marx, Lenin and other Communist leaders contended, and a better one too, if their opinion is to be accepted as correct? Have we in India genuine Parliamentary Government; or have we what the English people call a Caucus Government? No political machinery, and democracy is a machine, has the power to act by itself, self-propelled, self-directed and with an infallible genius for moving in the right direction automatically. Is it a clock which has been wound up for all time and which keeps astronomical accuracy of movement? Or is it like any other human institution to be worked by man, and is therefore liable to be worked in different ways, and devious ones to boot, according to our character or lack of character? Parliamentary Government, like any other form of Government, is a tool, and has neither hand nor heart nor head. What are the types of people whom we have chosen to be our leaders? Or, to put it differently, what are the types of leaders that have found in us followers? Are they those that have naturally assumed, by their personality, service, and experience, the position of leaders? Or are they machine-made, party-made and artificial puppets set up today to be pulled down tomorrow? How does leadership in our country compare, in so far as we could institute such comparisons, with leadership abroad? It is said that in France the people do not want men of great ability to be their Presidents. They are haunted by the memories of Napoleon and fears of dictatorship. In England, on the other hand, none but men of the first rank could ever rise to leadership; and they rise, as it were, naturally. As they are not pulled up, they are not pushed down either. They are an evolution and not a manufacture. In America, the types vary. But, on the whole, Governors and Presidents, excepting probably two or three

like Van Buren, have been men of real good stature, of vision, understanding, sympathy and statesmanship. Does democracy, functioning through Party, prefer to have big men, true men, straight men and honest men at the top ? Or does it prefer to have men who would be figure-heads ? — that is to say, figures without a head ; who could be easily managed by Party wire-pullers.

Then, there are democratic institutions of different grades and levels. In India we have a Central Parliament and a Central Government at Delhi. I call it "Government", though it is also a Cabinet ; for the members are not all drawn from one Party. So far, our Central Government has been a Government of efficiency like the one in Switzerland and not a mere Party Cabinet. Then, we have Legislatures and Cabinets in the different States composing the Union ; and in each State there are District Boards, Municipalities, etc., and other democratic institutions of a lower grade and level with limited jurisdiction and functions. We are not concerned with the range and functions of these bodies but rather with their integrity and efficiency. The point for consideration is : Do all these, namely, Central, State and Local democracies, function at about the same level of integrity, efficiency and scrupulous regard for the honour and interest of the country and its parts ?

These are not questions of theory. They are questions of actuality. Opinions may differ regarding the answers and also regarding the explanations and grounds on which the answers are based. If somebody avers that so and so was elected because it was thought that he would be amenable to the discipline of the Caucus, it is a matter of opinion. If it is said that so and so was got rid of because he was too honest, as though there could be too much of honesty, that again is a matter of opinion. The members of the Caucus may have sincerely thought that they were electing the best man and it may turn out to be otherwise. In this academic lecture, I can only pose the problems and indicate the lines of enquiry. You can give the answers for yourselves.

The democracies of today have one feature unknown to those of the past. The classical books on the realistic and naturalistic

treatment of this subject are, to mention only a few by way of illustration, Bryce's book on the American Commonwealth ; Bodley's on France ; the Polish savant, Ostrogorsky's book on Parties and Party Governments ; the American Lowell's on Governments and Parties in Continental Europe ; Jephson's book on the Platform and such like that give factual, concrete presentation of the subjects, of course with their own comments and reflections. But these books were written before a new factor in world organization emerged, namely, the United Nations.

This organization may prove a success or it may not prove a failure, but it is undoubtedly a great venture in the ethical organization of One World as distinguished from its old nationalistic divisions based on physical force. You cannot expect a new, novel, gigantic experiment of this kind to leap to success the very next day like some mushroom companies which begin by paying high dividends today and become insolvent tomorrow. Moral institutions, even Educational for instance, do not yield results quickly and without many ups and downs. They rest on our faith in human nature, faith that braves fact and actuality. They are our hope of today which we dearly wish would become the realisation, if not of tomorrow, but of some future not too far distant. Perhaps with institutions like the United Nations which have to overcome our heritage of war and strife and racialisms and colourisms, a slow growth is inevitable. Perhaps the slower the growth, the stronger will be the institution and more deep rooted and longer in life.

The U.N.O. has achieved at least this much. It has made War, generally speaking, a trifle more difficult than it used to be before. The Nations can now meet and give vent to their feelings openly and by public speeches instead of drawing swords. For the present it is a moral influence, impaired here also by the irreconcilable, ideological antagonisms between communism with its dictatorships and regulated individualism with its parliamentary freedom. Whether it will ever become a Super-State, a secular power, functioning impartially and judicially, it is too soon to tell ; but perhaps not likely. It has not been too conspicuous a success in Indonesia. It has not been a success at all in Cochin China ; and about

Kashmir, the less said the better. Still we must admit that it is a new factor in world history with possibilities which cannot be under-estimated. To what extent it influences democracies and States is a different problem.

Let us begin by distinguishing between a State and a Democracy. A State may be a monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, dictatorship of the Roman type, otherwise sometimes called Caeserism or democratic dictatorship when the peoples themselves vote and give full powers to a single individual as they did to Cincinnatus, and Quintus Fabius Maximus, when the State was in danger from foreign aggression or internal convulsions. The U.N.O. deals primarily with States and not with the forms of Government under which the States are ruled. Up to a point, it could also be approached directly by the people of the different States over the heads of their Governments. And so it can have a moral influence through its Trusteeship and other organizations on the types of Government that now exist and their conduct ; as, for instance, in regard to the treatment of the coloured people in South Africa and the place to be given to Eritrea in any Ethiopian Federation. Naturally it has not been much of an immediate success in democratising and moralising the forms and conduct of Governments especially where racial prejudices vitiate the spirit of humanism which is the ultimate foundation of the U.N.O. But still it is a leaven that may transform the world.

Owing to the tension between the Anglo-Saxon Powers and the Soviet Union, the U.N.O., in which the majority belong to the Anglo-Saxon Bloc, cannot always afford to consider questions impartially and from the point of view of the highest ethics it is supposed to embody. It has to judge by interests, the Anglo-Saxon especially. Here too, facts and impressions intermingle. Why, during the World War we called Stalin a Democrat. Today, he is to be regarded as a Hitler standing upside down. Turkey was regarded as a Democracy. Though I was carrying on propaganda in my own small way for the Allies as a National War Front Leader, I would not subscribe to the view that whoever was with us was a democrat and whoever was against us was a Fascist or Nazi, though orthodox propaganda rested on the simple idea that my doxy is orthodoxy, and the other fellow's doxy is heterodoxy.

Now in regard to the origin of democracy in India, one of the questions to be asked and one which has to be asked at every stage is: How far does the institution represent an indigenous growth, native to our soil; or is it something that has been wholly or largely imported? Then again, granting that it is an importation, does it necessarily follow that it is something that we can never assimilate and must eschew? To give an illustration in broad general terms, to which exception may be taken by some critics, is not the Judiciary, as it is organized and functioning today, more or less a British creation? I think it is. Of the few institutions that still retain their integrity, unsullied and unquestionable, are our High Courts. The Universities also are more or less a British creation, but I do not think they are so unsullied as the High Courts. Our Army with the first class fighting material has been a characteristically British formation. The Army, as it is today, with its discipline, its code of honour, its law of obedience, loyalty and political neutrality is a British institution. We have assimilated these institutions as part of our national constitution. But I do not mean to imply or to suggest that they would always be preserved in their present integrity and character for ever. Certain conditions produced them, and so long as these conditions remain or are improved upon, they will also remain and grow to loftier, nobler proportions. But our conditions may change, and they may not always change for the better. There are no mechanical and physical uniformities in history, only probabilities and tendencies. Let us hope that these institutions will continue to function and flourish as heretofore. There are other institutions also that the genius of India has incorporated into its being. I do not propose to give a complete catalogue. I am not going to be exhaustive, but only illustrative. The fact that an institution has been imported from outside is no charge against it except in the minds of some atavistic nationalists who quarrel over whether we shall have Arabic numerals or Sanskrit numerals, and therefore by way of neutrality, recommend Roman numerals. Once again, let me say, importation as such from foreign cultures and civilisations is neither a crime nor a sin. Consider what has happened to our Constitution. At one time we talked grandly and glibly about Hind-Swaraj, and a Constitution that was to be entirely different from Western abominations and extremely original and piously derived from our

ancestors and the most ancient Hindu history or mythology. Does any one talk of Hind-Swaraj today? Rather we went to America, England and even British India for the materials of our Constitution. We talked about Panchayat Raj, Village Republics and government by saints forgetting that a government by saints is far more dangerous than one by sinners. True that we need not adopt a thing because it is foreign or even because it is native. Origin does not always determine or denote value. The lotus springs from the ooze, but it is not ooze. Times have changed, history moves and we have to adjust ourselves and adopt what we judge to be good for the present and for the future. If we cannot live in the present or have a future, believe me, the past also will disappear, forgotten, unremembered. It is only the living that can perform ancestor worship. The dead cannot worship their ancestors. And if we do not leave a strong, healthy progeny, we too won't in our turn, be worshipped as ancestors. So, the only relevant consideration is whether a measure will help us to live and to survive. Its origin is irrelevant; its value is the only relevancy; and, of course, that value depends on our capacity to utilise it.

In our country where for nearly two hundred years we had education and were free to cultivate ideas but under enforced guarantees that we took no action, thought and reason functioned, too often without reference to realities. Conduct cannot ignore reality, but thought may. So to a certain extent we have got into the habit of cultivating ideas without any assurance that we would act accordingly.

For instance, there are people in India who call themselves Leftists or Rationalists. They are ready to adopt whatever movements spring up in Europe or America in these lines, bodily to adopt from abroad. But are these Indian Movements real grafts which could be attached to the stem of our civilization and grow on its roots? Are they natural growths from our life? Or are they mere echoes and imitations, more aping than aiming? We have a tendency to imitate instead of trying to grow from and on our own history. Take the length of time that took for the Leftist movement to grow and become a power in England. About 1900 the Labour Party was just struggling to come into shape and activity. There was only one Labour Member in Parliament. The Party developed slowly. It rested on the foundations furnished by flourishing Trade Unions. Some of the Trade Unions were main-

taining students at Oxford and Cambridge to provide for themselves the intellectuals required. They did not start with political aspirations and with political power. It was for the sake of economic betterment that they gradually developed political influence to begin with; then became a political factor; and after the First World War, emerged into political power. They illustrated the doctrine of gradualism, associated with the names of Mr. and Mrs. Webb. The other day, the Supreme Court of the United States imposed a fine of one hundred thousand dollars on Mr. Lewis, the Leader of the Miners who went on an illegal strike; and the fine was paid. If in our country a Trade Union leader was fined five hundred rupees, they would be going about the streets for donations. With us the historical process seems to be reversed. Our Trade Unions and Labour are aiming at power before they have acquired economic standing and organizational stability. As they have got the vote, they are able to influence politicians and getting them to bid against each other for their support, a regular auction. In this way, we seem to be jumping or reversing the processes of Western History. If economic strength leads to power, may not power lead to economic strength? They act and react on each other—healthily let us hope.

At its root and in its essence, Democracy is a spirit and an influence; and it rests on the character of the people. The outer forms might change but the spirit of freedom, of government by discussion, and give and take, of consideration for the interests of the people and the country, these constitute the soul of Democracy, the immortal part of it, while its embodiment in institutions may change, perish and be renewed. According to the historian Freeman, the origin of the House of Commons is to be found in the *Landes Gemeinden* of the German forests. The spirit of democracy was there in the forests; but it took centuries to evolve into the House of Commons. And they, in Great Britain, got universal franchise only recently after centuries of struggle. I do not mean to say that struggle as such is necessary, but it does implant in a people a sense of practicality and capacity to work together in organized formations. It makes you understand the difficulties and how to overcome them and promotes a sense of realism. The result is that the leaders of the Trade Unions in England make good administrators who could be trusted to manage big departments of State. A struggle helps to form judgment and character. But here in India we have got various rights and institutions as a result of developments abroad and the reflex effects they have produced in our atmosphere, though not, of course, without effort on our part.

Even reception is an effort. Students of Political Science should consider to what extent these rights and privileges are growths of our life from within or off-shoots of our own life, and how far they are the upstarts of theory and imitation. I do not mean thereby that all theoretical importations are bound to be a failure. Failure or success depends upon how we operate. History will determine that. All that I can do, as a student of Political Science, is to see which is the indigenous growth, with respect to which the probability is that it would be a success ; and which, though imported from abroad, has been properly assimilated, in respect of which also the probability is that it would be a success; and which are more speculative, derived more from theory and logic rather than from our life and vitality, the life that was previously led or that which is being led now or will be tomorrow.

Similarly, in regard to women's franchise. Of course, they deserve it. They deserve everything ; but in the West they got it by honest labour, while here more as a result of man's chivalry and of abstract logic.

Representative Democracy works mainly through parties. It cannot work otherwise. In our country, the big party, the one that counts decisively, is the Congress. One of the criticisms levelled against our democracy is that we have a one-party Government, with no opposition worth taking into account. Mr. P. R. Das, and that brilliant and independent thinker, Mr. Radha Binod Pal, have said a good deal about how we today have fallen short of the ideals of democracy which we upheld before we got power. But what I would like to ask is this : When did any country have a rather balanced two-party Legislature soon after a revolution or a Government with an effective opposition ? A revolution can bring only the revolutionaries into power, that is to say, if they can escape the jail. When such people come into power, what else is possible except that they should shoulder the responsibility of Government ? Even so, our Central Government has risen above Party in its composition and in its policies and functioning. If a revolutionary party, after it comes into power or seizes power, suppresses all other schools of opinion and other parties, that would be a different and a serious charge. That is Totalitarianism.

I do not believe that the Congress is out to destroy every other party and maintain itself by force of State power in office for ever.

One of the peculiarities with us is that parties defeated in elections tend to dissolve. They do not in some cases retain their

formation intact to fight another battle. Yet though a defeated party may dissolve into thin mist, the ideas that it had stood for may continue to be influential and effective. As an instance, take the Justice Party. Many of the members of the Justice Party have joined the Congress. I suppose such people would gladly join any party in power. This remark is not confined to members of any one party; but it is more or less true of many of our people, though of course, not of all. The fact is, I suppose, that the disciples are far smaller in number than camp followers. About the English it is said that they never know when they are beaten; the Army retreats, re-forms and fights again. In India, until we reached the Sikh period, we had only battles and no wars; one battle finished the whole business. At the same time, we must see whether the influence of a party, which has disappeared, is not still there, a subtle infiltration into the victor. My friend, Mr. Khasa Subba Rao, says that the soul of the Justice Party has transmigrated into the South Indian Congress. I do not know if this is so. But we must distinguish between the life of an organization and the life of the ideas that it embodied. The body may die but the ideas may live on. I think in our country sufficient recognition is not given to this important point, namely, the distinction between ideational politics and organizational politics. There is a great field for ideas, wherein people not caring about getting into parliaments and offices and cabinets, may give the results of their thought which may have a great influence on opinion and through opinion on politics. Mr. M. N. Roy, for some time dabbled with the idea of setting up candidates and contesting elections. A year ago he very wisely decided to have nothing to do with organizational politics but to carry on propaganda for his philosophy of radical humanism. There is always a big scope for "ideal" politics; and here, Universities might achieve a great deal without taking active part in politics, party or non-party.

In addition to the big parties, we may have also groups formed to promote particular causes or interests. In our Legislatures such groups are often formed after the elections, too many of them, I think. I was myself guilty of forming such a party — United Nationalists, after the elections; and the only thing I would say about it is that it grew sufficiently strong to put up candidates at the following election to fight the ministerialists. The other day, Mr. K. T. Shah is supposed to have formed a party at the Centre in opposition to Congress, a party of twelve members. I would call it a group rather than a party. In what sense could we call an *ad hoc* group of a dozen men coming together after election,

a party? It is best called a group, at least to start with, until it can organize on a country-wide scale.

Groups are sometimes formed within a party not to oppose it but to stimulate it to better policies and greater activity. When Mr. Balfour was Prime Minister, some Conservatives joined together to form a Ginger Party in order to pepper the Government, if I may use an Irishism. Groups are not parties. A group may be critical but at the same time loyal to the party. In England such criticism is not resented. I am afraid that in India where we are, politically speaking, more raw and sensitive, such criticism is resented by the party leaders. A cry for disciplinary action goes up. Regimentation is aimed at in our parties to what would be considered to be an undesirable, unhealthy, extent. The reason probably is that we have been so badly disorganized in the past and for so long, that we naturally attach extreme importance to discipline and mistake political organization for regimentation and adopt " theirs is not to question why " ethics. This swing from one extreme to another is natural though not quite reasonable.

The smaller the group, you will generally find, the more ambitious the programme that it announces, because it knows that it will never be called upon to form a Government and operate it. My friend, Mr. K. T. Shah, has issued a programme in which everything is free and universal. His is a free and universal party. Free and universal education, free and universal medical relief, free and universal health, free and universal old age and old age pensions. I thank my stars that he has not included free and universal marriages. If these gentlemen, without caring for the cost that these programmes involve and the gigantic and honest administrative supervision and machinery they need, carry out these policies, the result would be free and universal deaths, after which there won't be any room for anything free or universal.

One of the fallacies about democracy is that it has a divine right and supreme jurisdiction over everything in the State. The right being divine, it is also regarded as ethical. If people would understand the limitations of democracy, the nature of its scope and authority, they would not be so idolatrous. Has democracy any say in the matter of religion, of science, of culture or literature? Is our conscience subject to majority rule and regulation? But people say that these are outside the relevant field and that it is only in the field of politics that it should be regarded as being rightfully supreme and as having a divine claim on the implicit obe-

dience of the people. Democracy may have a legal right to have sway over its own citizens. It has no legal right over foreign politics and it cannot stop external aggression by its vote, however unanimous. A Foreign Power, so minded, will invade whatever your vote. Even in such highly democratic countries as England and America, people do not concede the theory of the omnipotence of the Legislature, even when elected by universal adult franchise. Why, for instance, do Labour Unions go on strike, if everything has to be settled by democracy either through its elected representatives in the Legislatures or through a Plebiscite ? A strike implies two postulates : firstly, a denial of the supreme right of democracy to govern particular interests of particular classes comprised within it. In Madras, for instance, even the subordinate officials went on strike. In fact, at present there is nobody in India who is not prepared to strike if he could. Secondly, a strike implies an assertion of the right to direct action which is a negation and defiance of the principle of rule by representatives. Our Congress itself exercised this right of direct action through passive Non-Co-operation, boycott of courts and colleges, violation of Salt Laws and other measures. We invented a new type of strike, not known to the materialistic West — hunger strike ; and this, in addition to what is imposed by famine. The other day, a lady in Delhi, a young and romantic lady I was told, went on hunger strike for the sake of Hindi. I quite admit that a woman is far more dangerous when she refuses food for herself than when she does it to her husband. One may then ask : if the majority have no right to regulate everything by their votes and that even in the most advanced democracies, people claim the right to disobey, defy and to take direct action and exercise direct pressure, what then is the secret of such success as democracy has been able to achieve ? Incidentally, one may remark that the theory of communism is an extreme form of the theory of strike, namely, disobedience plus violent direct action. As Bagehot pointed out, the essence of democracy is that it is Government by discussion. You can have a Government by discussion even in a Monarchy, but few kings would care to discuss subjects, except with their own officials, or yield to the opinion of a dissentient majority. In an oligarchy, this fear in the leaders of free and frank discussion is naturally less but sufficient to make it generally unavailable. The chief merit about democracy is that the rulers are the people themselves, ruling through the representatives they elect. The range, extent, and the material for discussion are much larger ; and in such a discussion it is possible, nay, very probable, that commonsense and reason would pervail. But, of course, there could be no certainty.

Even a democracy could rule wrongly and exercise tyranny, provocative of rebellion. Tyranny does not cease to be tyranny because it is exercised by the majority. Good and bad, right and wrong, are eternal; they are laws written on adamantine tables. All unreasonable exercise of power is tyranny, whatever may be the legal forms through which it is exercised. Even a democracy has no right to put itself above the moral law. The ballot box is not the final judgment. History is the final judgment. That is why emphasis has been laid by thinkers on character and on the ethical factor as the secret of good and therefore successful, stable Government.

I have said that representative democracy has to work through party. Is a Single Party Government undemocratic? How are parties constituted in different countries and what are their relations to the Governments and Cabinets?

A survey, however brief, would show that there are various types of Democratic Governments. In England, you have the removable Executives. The real power is the Prime Minister. He could be removed by a vote of the Legislature and not by a vote of the Party. A no-confidence motion, if carried, results in the defeat of the Ministry, but not necessarily in its removal and replacement, for the Prime Minister could advise the King to dissolve the House of Commons. The Premier might thus appeal to the country. In France, the President is elected by the National Assembly. He has very little power. Every French Premier has to obtain a positive vote of confidence at two stages before his Government could function or feel free to function. First, when he is called to the Premiership and asked to form a cabinet; and secondly, after he has formed his cabinet. Under the multi-party system — the number of parties is many more than two — prevalent in France, stable Governments have become impossible. Hardly any government has lasted a year. In the U. S. A., there is an Irremovable Executive, the President, with enormous powers based on the French Revolution doctrine of separation of powers. The Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary are separate and each represents one aspect of the sovereignty of the State. In Eire, there is yet another system of Executive Government. In Switzerland, the Executive is non-party in character and in a sense non-removable. Yet, it is completely responsible to the Legislature. It functions as a Board of Directors. It has no policies of its own. It recommends to the Legislature and carries out the decisions of the Legislature loyally and faithfully. Efficiency is its motto, and

the Swiss Government has never lacked efficiency. Representative Democracy is limited by Direct Democracy in the shape of Initiative and Referendum. Then, there are various Republics in South America which are also democracies and where also there are Presidents with vast powers. But these are not always elected by the people in the sense in which they are elected in the United States of America or in France. The one good thing about South American Republics is that there are no general elections, only general revolutions, one good result of which is there is no practical place for franchise for women. These are also democracies, which shows what a dangerous thing democracy could be sometimes.

Is a one party system undemocratic ? In the first place, is it a system imposed by law or did it happen to come into existence through chance and temporary circumstances ? In theory, unless it has been imposed by law or by the power of the State, as in the U.S.S.R., it may not be said to be wrong politically or ethically. In India people are free to vote. Parties are free to put up candidates. Candidates may stand as isolated independents. But suppose the majority of the people vote for Congress, and Congress wins all the seats, could it be said that the Congress has become undemocratic ? Is Congress under a political or moral obligation to court defeat here and there or to vote for some opposition candidates and get them returned ? An absurdity too ridiculous for words ! Even Cæsarism or Dictatorship by the people's vote may not be, analytically speaking, undemocratic. The Opposition must be a growth and not a manufacture. Even Hitlerism may be regarded as a Democratic Dictatorship — up to a limit. It is only when a Dictator so installed or a Party so put in power suppresses all possible opposition that it becomes Facist, that is to say, dictatorial in an anti-democratic sense. This was the case in Germany under Hitler, and now, as far as we know, in the Soviet Republic. In the U.S.S.R. elections are reduced to a farce. There is only one list and people must vote for or against. The justification of the single list is that people are given the negative vote. People could say, we do not want a particular candidate or this particular list. What happens if the people negative the list presented by the Dictator ? If they escape Siberia, they would be asked to vote for another list, similarly set up by Government. The form of Government and the substance of Government are two different categories. The form may be good, but the substance bad, and vice versa. How the system works in Russia one cannot be certain, because it is enveloped in the mists of propaganda and kept out of the knowledge of disinterested enquirers by the Iron Curtain.

Even Ambassadors, accredited to Moscow, cannot travel about the country freely or see things for themselves or meet people in the way it is done in London or Paris. But it must be generally agreed that in the Soviet system the economic good of the people is well promoted and their material well-being promoted actively and positively. Lenin and other philosophers of Communism have held that the political rights and individual freedom and the scope given to competition in the West are not compatible with economic democracy. Under competition some go up while others go down. Examining the slogan, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, it could be argued that Liberty may destroy Equality, and that Equality necessitates State regulation which practically deprives the individual of freedom as it is understood in the West and in America.

Lenin was particularly severe on Parliamentary Democracy. It was defective in two respects. Firstly, it does not give the people real choice. They have to choose between two or more persons, all set up by Parties or standing as individuals. Where there is no contest, there is not even this amount of choice; the people are supposed to accept passively. Choosing between X, Y, and Z, who are set up by parties, is not the same thing as the people choosing freely. A limited choice is no choice. For intsance, the people may like to elect a good Professor of the University, say, Professors of Economics or Politics, to be their representatives. But no Party wanting to have peace within its ranks, would choose them as its candidates.

The second criticism is that Parliamentary Democracy is plutocratic, that is to say, it gives advantage to the rich over the poor. A good deal of money has to be spent by the candidates. They must have agents. They must print their manifestos. This is the season when many people come to the candidate for subscriptions to build temples and other holy and pious purposes. If you do not give them money, you cannot get their votes, whatever may happen to the temple. Money power is necessary, from which Lenin deduces the proposition that Parliamentary Government is a type of Capitalistic Government. I am not saying that this argument is unassailable. Any sensible person would ask: Granting that there are these defects, what then is the alternative? Is the Soviet alternative any more reasonable and democratic or less open to objection? The negative vote is not a positive choice. Furthermore, a negative vote might qualify you for political education in a Concentration Camp.

What is the relationship between Parties, Cabinets and Governments ? In the United States, we have the Presidential system of Government, on which Woodrow Wilson has written a book of profound thought and great authority. The country is administered by the Executive. The President appoints anybody he chooses to his cabinet. The member need not be a Party man. In fact, the second Roosevelt drew some of his cabinet colleagues from the opposite party — the Republicans. True, such appointments require ratification by the Senate sitting in Executive Session. But the convention has grown up that the Senate hardly ever vetoes a Presidential nomination. The Senate may be Republican and the President a Democrat, which has happened some times. But when the Democratic President sends up his nomination to the Secretaryship of State or Ambassadorships and such other appointments, the convention of the Senate is to agree. For if you give the Executive responsibility, you must give it the power to choose its instruments for discharging that responsibility. You cannot hamper the Executive by forcing it to have colleagues that it cannot trust. I suppose the Americans are not so logical as we, Indians, are. For here the moment we put a man in power, we proceed to control him straightaway from the very next day. In America, they are more practical and less logical. So long as the work goes on well, they do not bother whether the Executive Cabinet of the President is composed of Party men or whether it is constituted of non-party men or even the Oppositionists.

In England the Party does not directly have anything to do with the formation of Government. Leadership is a natural evolution ; hardly ever is it a case of a contested election and canvassing for a majority. The Prime Minister, so evolved, is commissioned by the King to form the cabinet and he forms it. If anybody came and told him, " You shall not have this man ; you must have this other man ", a Gladstone, as Morley put it, would show him the door. A Premier would exercise freedom in choosing his Cabinet and would not tolerate interference. If interfered with by powerful combinations, he would resign. Mr. Atlee the other day removed Mr. Shinwell from one ministry to another. He did not call a Cabinet meeting to decide this. Neither did he call a Party meeting ; nor a general meeting of the entire Labour Party in the country. No Prime Minister in England would care to be a mere Registrar of the Party. He is a Leader, a voice, and not an agent and echo. But let us remember that all institutions work according to the genius of the particular people concerned and our Parliamentary system has been working according to our genius.

I am not prepared to say that our genius is not the best, but certainly it is unique. In other countries the Party as such is undoubtedly instrumental in returning members to the Legislature, but it is hardly ever allowed to determine the composition of the Cabinet. It has certainly a voice as to who shall be the Prime Minister. But, here again, the process is something natural, and I had almost said, ethical. There is hardly a contested election like what we witness in India with canvassing and wire-pulling. It is more selection than election; and in a real sense, nomination by general consensus of opinion. The Leader, as it were, is already there, he has to be recognised, and not made. When Russell relinquished the Premiership, Gladstone succeeded him. When Gladstone left, there was Rosebery, and so on. The Conservatives were defeated in the last elections, but Churchill is still the Leader of the Conservative Party. There was something like a contest, when Mr. Balfour resigned, between Mr. Walter Long and Sir Austen Chamberlain. When the Whips discovered by prior quiet talks with the members of the Conservative Party that opinion was a bit divided, the members including Long and Chamberlain unanimously agreed on having another prominent Statesman as Leader and Mr. Bonar Law became the uncontested choice. But even this is an exception to the British rule of succession which passes on as by a natural process of heritage.

I have never known in England what is called "Annual Leadership". Here, in India, we say "we have absolute confidence in you as our Leader but only for twelve months". I wonder if this is due to the desire of everybody to have a finger in the Premier Pie, and mutual distrust and suspicion and incapacity for a stable, organized life. An organization must have a head, hand, etc. But here everybody wants to be head whether he has one or not. I prefer the English system in which leadership continues in the same person until he retires or is removed. Or, if a life tenure is found to be too much of an aristocratic tradition, then we could have leaders for the duration of the Legislature, that is to say, until after the following general elections. In Ireland, after each general election, the Leader is chosen and he forms his Cabinet. Nobody interferes with him in Cabinet appointments. Mr. De Valera was chosen Leader after each general election a number of times. In England the Leader being a natural evolution he really leads and continues to lead. This we find to be the case in our Central Government and in some of the States. There is a tendency in our country to make of the Leader a Registrar of

the Party. He has to consult the Party at every turn. If there is a vacancy in an office, he must consult the members and follow the decision of the majority. In very real fact, we have Party Government here rather than Parliamentary, excepting in the Centre certainly and perhaps in some of the States.

People talk of Parliamentary Democracy in India. How could we say that we have Parliamentary Democracy when every Bill is to be presented to the Party and passed by it first, before it could be introduced in the Legislature; and where the Legislature, in view of the enormous majority of the Party, is simply a body that registers the bills as thus passed? It is more like a Registry, to use an expression current in British Universities. This seems to be the process obtaining even in respect of budgets.

Recently, a member of the Labour Government in England was brought to book for doing things which, according to the British code of public life, he ought not to have done. The charge against him was that he interfered with the orders that, under British Public Ethics, had to be passed by the Head of the Department. The Head of a Department in England is not the Private Secretary of the Minister. He has got his functions and his jurisdiction. He must be allowed to discharge his responsibilities, discharge it freely without interference. According to the written or unwritten Code of British Public Life, subjects fall under three or four categories; those that could be disposed of by the Heads of the Departments; at a higher stage, those that could be disposed of by the Minister or the Secretary of State; and at a still higher stage, by the Minister under sanction of the Prime Minister; or by the Prime Minister himself. Subjects of still higher importance pertaining to high policy or to controversial issues go to the Cabinet as a whole. The Prime Minister can dispose of everything, but he has to reckon with resignations of his colleagues if he pushes his prerogatives too far. But he has very large powers. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman directed Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary, to give full support to France against Germany at the Algeciras Conference and no Cabinet was called to authorize this or confirm.

As a result of the Great War, another development has taken place, namely, the Inner Cabinet of the more prominent members which met frequently to take momentous decisions relative to the War. No Minister in England could claim as a legal right that any question shall be brought before the Cabinet, as it were,

over the head of the Prime Minister and submitted to the decision of a majority vote in the Cabinet. It has been noted by John Morley that votes were rarely ever taken in the Cabinet. After discussion, the Prime Minister would state what the general feeling and sense was, and that statement would be accepted as conclusive without question. If the matter is of sufficient importance as, for instances, Home Rule, and some members were not prepared to agree, they would resign; and the Prime Minister, if he could, would carry on without them. It is not a Government by mechanical process, but a Fine Art in which the Prime Minister plays the leading role. John Morley states that it was a blunder on the part of Gladstone when, on a certain occasion (Naval Estimates), once only I think, Gladstone took a vote in the Cabinet instead of announcing his decision arrived at after discussion. Of course, we, in India, are at the beginning of things. We have not yet had enough experience. Right till now, we were actuated by a great moral purpose, the struggle for Independence, and by a real desire to carry on the Government in the best possible traditions of public honour and integrity. Our will is good; our judgment will develop under time and experience. While the heart beats strong and true, there is no need to be pessimistic.

Another curiosity is this. I have not come across in foreign countries the kind of charges that have been made against Ministers here by fellow members of the same Party. If such charges are made, what should be the procedure for securing an impartial judgment? I am not taking sides. I am not corrupt because, you see, I have no opportunity. There were two cases of possible corruption or mala fide administration in England within the last thirty years or so. The first related to Mr. John Thomas, a Cabinet Minister. Lord Justice Porter was appointed to conduct the enquiry. The other was about Mr. John Belcher. Another Justice of the King's Bench was requested to go into this matter. What is the logic underlying these enquiries? I think they are a proof of the high standard of honour and public morale prevailing in England. They will not tolerate anything which is below par; even the Party will not tolerate. When a Minister functions below par, it is regarded not merely as a matter for the particular Party to which he belongs, but for the Legislature and the whole country. And the notice to be taken should be entirely, wholly judicial. The country is not the private property of the Party in office. Such charges, therefore, should not be left to the Party and the Party leadership, but to the judgment of a judicial tribunal — provided of course, the charges are seriously made and are prima facie

substantial and not merely exercises in the art of vexing and worrying the opponent and slinging mud. The other day * our Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, exemplified by his judgment the high standards of rectitude which our National Leadership has maintained. We are proud and grateful that it is so. Still such charges, provided they are bona fide, should go before a Judicial Tribunal. That will save it from possible charges of bias and bad motive. Note also when these lapses from honour and public morality take place, the Opposition in England does not make party capital out of such unsavoury incidents. The Government and Opposition collaborate in securing and enforcing the British code of honour. Honour and dishonour are national and not party concerns.

We have to distinguish between Parliamentary Democracy and Party Democracy. Parliamentary Democracy concerns all the people in the country, irrespective of Party, and, therefore, in the actual conduct of our public affairs, we ought to see that it is given the higher place in reality.

In some countries at the time of general elections they instal a temporary non-party Cabinet. In Egypt, for instance. Analytically speaking, this seems to be a defective procedure. There is no need to distrust the honesty and integrity of Party Governments. A Party man elevated to the Bench acts as a conscientious Judge without party or other prejudices. Similarly a Party Government might remain neutral at elections in the sense of not exercising undue or improper influence and using its officials and police to coerce or to corrupt the voters. A Party Government could be an honest Government. Secondly a Party, like a religious body, has the right to convert people to its own views and policies. And so, analytically speaking, it cannot be said that there would or should always be some prominent people, not belonging to any Party whatsoever. Of course, the only people who do not belong to any Party, because they are precluded from Party membership, are the officials. But nobody proposes that officials should be in charge of Government at the time of general elections. Then what about bye-elections? The idea that there would be or should be some prominent men with no Party affiliations or sympathies is not a logical necessity of public life ; nor is it likely to be very probable. Such proposals imply a feeling that a Party Government could not be trusted to be fair at elections. That again, as I said

* Complaints against the Bengal Ministry.

before, is not necessarily, and therefore universally, true. In England it does not matter which Party is in power. The elections are fair and nothing could be fairer. In America also it is the same. Mr. Bodley and other writers on Continental Politics have mentioned that at general elections, the Governments of the day are sure to secure a majority. On the Continent elections are not conducted with the fairness characteristic of England. There is something there in the sense of something rotten in the State of Denmark. But it is followed by nemesis. Majorities thus obtained do not remain stable, which is why Governments in France and some other continental countries are so short-lived. The majority does not remain reliable and loyal as in England, because it is not one obtained owing to the moral conviction of the people and candidates, but by manipulation of Governments and officials. A majority based on convenience cannot be relied upon to give firm, loyal support. That is why in France we have the Group or Poly-Party system and unstable Governments. What type of Government we shall have in India, of course, none could tell. At present, we have undoubtedly a Democratic Government of a special kind.

Consider the Independents. If they succeed in getting elected, they do not remain long independent except in rare cases. They generally join a Party or a Group guided by interests whether personal or public. An intellectual giant like John Stuart Mill could remain an independent and yet exercise profound influence on Governments and Parliaments. In the next general elections here, the Congress will, of course, put up as many candidates as there are constituencies. The Socialists will also appear on the scene in force and the other Leftist Groups also. The Leftist Groups may combine to oppose Congress, but they do not seem to be able to combine amongst themselves. Communal parties also may try to stage a revival. Analytically speaking, it is not impossible for a Party to serve the country while at the same time promoting the interests of a community, a class or other particularism as distinguished but not opposed to nationalism. If it is possible for the Labour Party in England to be just as patriotic as the Conservatives or Liberals, why may not a similar development occur in India? We should not start with prejudice in these matters, but should bring to bear an analytical outlook; though, of course, to speak analytically is one thing and to experience practically is quite another. Then, there are Communists. Instead of putting forward candidates, which is a costly process, they may put forward guns and pistols which would be cheaper, and if suc-

cessful more convincing. So far as any Party that believes in government by force is concerned, which is what Communism stands for, it is obvious that the State, whether it be Government by Congress, Socialists, or any other Party, will have to meet force with force and put it down with all the resources at its command.

I will conclude for today after briefly drawing your attention to one or two interesting facts of current politics.

The other day an old and respected member of the Congress Party avowed in open Legislature that though he was opposed to a Bill and did not like it, he would vote for it, because his Party had asked him to do so. Whatever the ethics of this might be, it is neither Parliamentary nor any other Democracy, nor even decency. Contrast this with the dignity of Burke's rejoinder, "Sir, I am a pillar of the State and not its weather cock". There seems to be something peculiar in our psychology in the way we estimate the values of public life. This gentleman is a friend of mine and certainly not below par in integrity. Contrast again with Gladstone's proud statement, the statement which the biographer of his political opponent characterised as that of a born leader of men, "Followed or not followed, I must pursue my way".

There are two types of Democracy illustrated by Congress— two different and divergent types — one at the Centre and the other in the Provinces. As regards the Provinces, you know the kind of leadership we have. I am not referring to any particular State or individual. I am talking of the genus, not the species; and how it is a matter of annual confidences and half-yearly no-confidences, how the Chief Minister is interferred with in administration by Party bosses and others, how Legislators interfere with officials in their administration which necessitated Mr. Omandur Ramaswamy Reddiar issuing a most revealing and significant and important circular to put down the corruption of wire-pulling. But think of the Centre and betake yourselves from the Cooum to the Jumna. There we have leaders like Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and others of like calibre, standing, and of resolute purpose. We may agree with them or we may differ. But we cannot but admire. There is no question here of annual leadership; no threat of no-confidence motions or nagging at Party meetings; because they are the people who created the Party. They are not the creatures of the Party. When the whole Congress, mind you the entire Party, passed a resolution at Jaipur which they did not approve of, they threatened to resign if the Congress did not withdraw the resolution; and the entire Congress retreated. During the war when the House of

Commons voted equal salaries to women, Mr. Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister — indispensable as War Leader — threatened to resign if that resolution was not cancelled, and the House cancelled the resolution. Such leaders go straight with their measures to the legislature instead of having it passed through the party and filtered previously before it is made drinkable by the legislators. Such Premiers could take into the Cabinet men of real worth, even if they do not belong to their Party. They realise that the country is passing through very difficult times. We are really in a state of war. Confusion within and ever-present possibility of aggression from outside on our frontiers. This is the time when in the language of England we should have Cabinets of National Concentration. In the Centre we have a Cabinet of National Concentration. It is our good fortune that we have such a cabinet in the Centre. You can now see how, though the Congress is a single party, it is functioning in two different and divergent ways, at the Centre and in the Provinces. This is proof that there is elasticity in our leadership and in the way they view problems and try to effect their solutions. Apparently the word of Gandhism prevails here and the spirit of Gandhism at the Centre. The Centre had the courage to tell our people to go slow with Prohibition. Congressmen at the Centre did not revile the Nehru Ministry for this and threaten to turn it out of office, whereas our friends in Madras weeded Mr. Prakasam out of office, because he wanted Prohibition in only four districts while our friends, opposed to him, felt that nothing less than eight districts would do, to undo Prakasam. The Centre has been advising Provinces not to pursue what are called idealistic policies until our material conditions have been improved and brought to a much higher level. People talk of power corrupting. It does not, not necessarily and universally. It is because our Central leaders have got supreme self-confidence in themselves and are self-reliant that they are able to take independent views and interpret our problems in terms of the interests of today and the requirements of tomorrow, without mistaking the word for the spirit and mechanical routine for the art of statesmanship. Let us be glad and grateful that in these difficult and dangerous times we have a Government capable of taking wise and valiant decisions.

LECTURE II

Wednesday, 31st August 1949 — 5-30 p.m.

In my talk yesterday, I omitted an important instance relevant to the question of public honour and ethics, and enquiries into the conduct of Ministers. I mentioned two instances, that of a Labour Cabinet Minister in a former Government and that of a Minister without Cabinet rank in a more recent Government. But there is another which goes back to 1913 or 1914. I happened to be in England at the time. I followed the events closely. It related to no less a person than Mr. Lloyd George. Some allegations had been made against him and Sir Rufus Isaacs (later Lord Reading) in respect of Stock Exchange speculations imputed to have been made on the inner knowledge they had of proceedings in the Cabinet — the *Marconi affair*. Mr. Asquith was the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister must satisfy himself that there is a case for enquiry, for it is he that empanels the Cabinet. He has confidence in the persons appointed as Ministers, and that is why he appoints them. And so, he must first satisfy himself whether the charges deserve to be gone into either judicially or parliamentarily. Mr. Asquith felt that Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Rufus Isaacs might have been guilty only of indiscretion and nothing worse. But in view of the public feeling he felt obliged to appoint a Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry. The conduct of a Minister is not a matter that is of consequence only to the Party to which he belongs. He is a member of a Government that administers the whole country, and not merely a Party. So, the whole country is interested, and has a right to be thus interested. Hence it is not a question to be decided upon by Party leaders and by Party enquiries, however capable and honest they may be. The enquiry should command the confidence of the country irrespective of Party. So Mr. Asquith appointed a Parliamentary Committee. The tradition of English politics in such cases is to invite a leading member of the Opposition to be the Chairman. The Chairman of that Committee was Lord Halsbury who had been several times Lord Chancellor in Tory governments. The great Lord Chancellor, after going into the matter, exonerated both his political opponents, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Reading — exonerated them honourably. I am proud to think that our Judiciary are not behindhand of England in integrity and capacity.

I have an uneasy feeling that similar incidents here are treated in a different manner and perhaps not better, at least in procedure. However, I will not pursue this analysis in its application to our Governments more minutely. Perhaps, we are functioning accord-

ing to our genius. In my school days, I used to function according to my genius in Mathematics and on more than one occasion, got zero. I hope this success will not be copied.

James Bryce has written a book of intensive interest to practical politicians on "Hindrances to Good Citizenship". They are hindrances also to good Governments and good Parliaments. But hindrances are not fatalities. They might be overcome, prevented and, in course of time, obliterated. So, if any defect is pointed out, it is with the desire to see it remedied and removed and uprooted.

The psychology of a personal, paternal Government is still very strong in our country. How could it be otherwise? Paternalism and Absolutism have been the atmosphere in which we have lived for generations, politically, socially and individually — lived but not thrived; and they cannot be exorcized in a day by the magic of legal enactments and moral platitudes. Character is not idea. It takes longer to develop. When a Minister travels, people flock round him, as though he is a ray of omnipotence. They, as it were, adore him and present him with all sorts of addresses, narrating their grievances and praying for speedy redress. The Minister also, not to be behindhand in the matter, makes promises and bestows verbal boons. He is never chary of promising them, because he has to live up to his popular standing as a ray of omnipotence. Every Minister is an Haroun-Al-Rasheed, but with this difference he does not go about in disguise but surrounded by the Police and the Party. The Departmental Heads, the Collectors, and all the administrators in the services, charged with the duty of accurate objective investigations and reports, are brushed aside. The Minister goes, sees, lunches, promises and sometimes passes orders.

So long as the psychology of personal patriarchal Government continues, Government by Rule of Law, as Dicey would term it, recedes into the background. We shall continue to have Government by Will, and not so much Government by Law. This has been our tradition. It will take some time for us to get over it. I have no doubt that with the help and lead given by our Publicists and our High Courts, we shall emerge into a more objective way of thought and conduct, overcoming these inherited subjective weaknesses. The spirit of constitutionalism is not at present so paramount and prevalent here as it is in England. The supremacy of Law over Will has not yet become firmly rooted in our political

life and conduct. The Party seems to be a kind of iron curtain between the Public and Parliament. In our Legislatures, Party members are not supposed to take free part in the debates. They are expected to raise their hands and keep their mouth shut except in the luncheon interval. This may be a practical way of getting through business quickly. Perhaps it makes for a certain type of efficiency. It is for you to ask whether the standards of our legislatures are as high today as they were in the days when questions were debated more openly and frankly even by Party men. In the House of Commons very often members take an independent line, and even talk against the Government of which they are, in the Party sense, followers. For, in addition to Party sense, there is a Parliamentary sense which is perhaps even a higher obligation. I remember Mr. Lloyd George telling us proudly in the Cambridge Union Society how he voted against the Rosebery Government on a motion of censure brought forward by the Opposition regarding the inadequate supply of cordite to the Army, though he knew that the defeat of Government would necessitate its resignation. But Lloyd George was not disciplined out of the Party permanently or for a period of five years. A member of the Legislature is, in a sense, a delegate of the Party, but in a higher sense, he is the representative of the country. In our country the need for discipline is felt to be so strong that for the moment Parliamentary Democracy seems to be partially eclipsed by Party discipline. We have been so fissiparous in the past, that this is probably a remedial swing to the other extreme.

We have got all the forms of Democracy, all the externals; a Speaker; a Leader of the House who is not permanent; and Leader of the Opposition who is permanent. Only the full soul is wanting for the moment.

Let me emphasise once again — always, if you please — that I am pointing out guardedly only possibilities and probabilities and no mathematical certainties; because in this field everything is fluid and there are no rigid uniformities. Nature and human nature sometimes follow different lines. As Bacon said allegorically "The same sun that hardens clay melts wax".

Yesterday I was dealing with the possibility of Caucus Government becoming a reality with us, reducing Parliamentary Government to a shadow and mockery. I must speak with the greatest hesitation and nervousness. In Madras the beginnings of Caucus Government arose when certain members of the Congress

Party joined together to kick out our standard Premier, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, from leadership, not knowing that they were really kicking him upstairs to the Governor-Generalship of the Indian Union. And when he rose to that eminence and visited Madras, there was quite a struggle and competition for precedence in garlanding him. We are, as you know, a very generous people. We always forgive those whom we have injured, provided they rise to success in spite of the injury and without help on our part. I dealt yesterday with what appeared to me to be the differences in organization and functioning between the Cabinet Government in the Centre and in some of our Provinces. I pointed out that the reality was in Delhi while the shadows were dancing in the Provinces. Our National Leaders, I might say, know how to learn and even more, how to unlearn, an essential requisite of progress. About the Bourbons, it was said that they forgot nothing and learnt nothing. Some of our leaders, per contra, have been successful in forgetting a large number of their previous slogans and also learning, to our advantage, a number of lessons from historical realism which they used to deride as materialism. By way of illustration. The State idea has now supplanted the Gandhian idea. We want things to be done on a grand scale and style to impress the foreigners, as though they would not know the difference between show and substance. Our Embassies abroad are not ascetic ashrams. They have Rolls Royce cars — too many of them — and all the paraphernalia of worldly grandeur. I am not opposed to this. I feel that some of our airy, fairy, so-called idealisms are really freakisms. So, when I mention these contradictions, I do not want to be understood as criticising the Congress on the ground of inconsistency and asking it to go back to the primitivisms which it once preached. Consistency, they say, is the virtue of small minds. Our National leaders today are anything but small minded. At one time Western Sciences were derided as materialistic abominations which should not be allowed to contaminate the spirituality of our holy civilisation. Today, the amount of encouragement that is being given to Sciences and Applied Sciences and to Research is something marvellous, and no less meritorious. No Government known to history has tried to wipe out the scientific arrears of over two hundred years with such vigour and vision as our National Government in New Delhi. I am most proud and most grateful. They no longer propagate the old ascetic life and philosophy of the loin cloth as the symbol of our moral superiority and sublime spirituality. Excepting in Madras we do not hear of pastoral life in Village Republics to be brought about by Government Orders, and Panchayats under

bureaucratic supervision. In the old days at every meeting of the Congress, the President used to be taken in procession in a cart drawn by twenty four to thirty six pairs of bullocks. It was a regular cattle show. The more the bullocks the greater the nationalism. Nor are we fighting our battles with the charka, as our invincible weapon, leaving our people to the protection of God and exploitation and enjoyment of ruthless enemies. We are fighting with historical, scientific weapons of as modern a pattern as we could manage to secure, under our neutrality, from the armouries of the West: the jet plane, cruiser and the armoured car. Even the Salt Tax is not condemned and tabooed, as something inconsistent with former philosophies of life. The Centre has asked us to go slow with moral reforms like, for instance, Prohibition that reduce our finances and material potential and weaken us in the international struggle for existence.

At one time it was thought that sartorial anarchy and idiosyncrasies were the symbol of purity and perfection. Now they have issued rules and regulations about dress. They want even the men to dress decently. So, we are moving on right lines, lines lighted by history with no fancy shadows darkening our course. Similarly, historical realism has, in a large measure, supplanted the old abstract so-called ethicalism. I say "so-called ethicalism", because, as was shown by the Danish philosopher, Hoffding, ideals that are not sociologically realisable are no ideals at all but myth and mirage. Every "ought", as the great philosopher Kant put it, must imply a "can". The "ought" should be realisable. The influence of historical realism is seen in many departments of our administration today. It is a common criticism levelled against Congress — with which I do not wholly agree — that an organization, the leader of which was once the President of the Civil Liberties Union, has now abridged those liberties to a much greater extent than the British. I have no statistics from which to tell you whether the extent of abridgement is greater or less or about the same, but that does not matter to the principle of the criticism. Even Bengal Regulation III of 1818 is kept alive and brought into occasional operation. This is the one Regulation against which Congress has been protesting for many, many years, from its inception, i.e. even from before the Gandhian era. We were all parties to that protest. But circumstances have proved stronger than our resolutions and the Regulation remains under our National Government, and remains in force. There are also the Security Laws and the Press Laws. If there are any Civil Liber-

ties left in these days, as one of my cynical friends remarked, they are in the High Courts and not in the Administration.

In the old Legislatures resolutions used to be passed that whenever firing was resorted to by the Police, there should be an independent judicial enquiry. You know what happened in Bengal. People were shot down even in Jail; and our Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, pointed out very rightly that there ought to have been held an independent enquiry. Naturally the Bengal Cabinet did hold an enquiry. It asked the Police to enquire into the firing. I suppose the Police were called upon to practise what is called "Yogic self-examination".

Is it that our Governments are heartless, that they love the people less, or are less devoted to freedom and liberty? Most certainly not. We cannot for a moment think that our leaders who suffered in jails are anxious to put others in jail. We must examine the situation dispassionately and see what objective facts and events had forced them to cry halt or to go slow with the policy of Civil Rights and Liberties. We have more Laws now in India than we had under the British, more laws and perhaps less freedom. How did it come about? The explanation is in the conditions of our country both internally and externally. To those of us that reflect seriously, some doubts have occurred about the country's solidarity and security. Are we so over-whelmingly strong as to make aggression from abroad or across our frontiers impossible? That aggression is not a fancy. It is a fact. To quote but one instance, it has occurred in Kashmir. Originally Pakistan denied that it had sent troops to Kashmir. This is an admission, a confession I should say, on the part of Pakistan that it had no right to send troops there. Then, when the truth could no longer be hidden or camouflaged, it admitted that it had sent its troups into Kashmir. Now it has gone one step further. It claims that Azad Forces are a part of the Pakistan Army. I suppose we are obliged to hope that this conflict would be settled by peaceful negotiation. Whatever our hopes, we ought to be prepared for eventualities. The situation in the world is disturbing, highly electrical. Conditions in Burma are not re-assuring. And it is at this fateful, frightful hour that all kinds of "isms" have been started to create commotions which, whatever their value as abstract logic and copy-book maxims, do not appear to me to promote our solidarity and strength — Linguisms, Provincialisms, Communalisms, Leftisms, Rightisms, and I suppose, Right-about-isms. These distract our attention from the main, imminent, per-

petual dangers. There is so much confusion in our politics today that enemies would be inclined to take advantage and try to smash up our country and its "isms". The economic situation is bad. Conditions of life are difficult and are growing more and more difficult. Whatever might be the long range policy which would cure and root out these defects, the immediate necessity is a strong Government, capable of preserving Law and Order within and peace from aggression from without — a Government that would be both shield and sword and that would not be taken by surprise, unprepared and unready.

I ask you : which country is there in the world that has allowed individual liberty to take precedence over State security during War or under conditions akin to War ? The United States has been the least affected of any country by wars ; and the western hemisphere has enjoyed the longest spell of peace and prosperity ; and yet there is far less individual liberty in America today than there was ten or twelve years ago. They are hunting and hounding out what they call anti-social elements — Un-American activities. Un-American means Anti-American ! It is like a witch hunt. You may ridicule it as mass hysteria, if you like. But I would rather have the hysteria that safeguards security than the hilarity which makes for indifference to our dangers.

Let us take a broader historical survey. The days of amplest individual liberty in England were the days when there was ascendancy of Liberal Ideas, the days of Lord John Russell, Palmerston, Gladstone, and also in a measure, of Canning, Peel and Disraeli. That constituted an epoch of peace, progress and plenty. It terminated with the outbreak of the First World War, which brought in its wake a large number of controls, limitations and restrictions on the liberty of the individual, and material poverty and distress. The World War was succeeded by a short spell of uneasy peace and economic depression. Leftist movements, which not always followed constitutional methods, grew ; and such movements, even when they did not advocate open force and violence, did not hesitate to exercise pressure and intimidation by direct action or threats of direct action. Another World War broke out, and yet greater restrictions had to be imposed on individual liberty and freedom than in the first World War. In the days of the old wars there were natural frontiers and obstacles like rivers, mountains and oceans dividing the military forces. A new factor — air power has very nearly obliterated the old natural frontiers. Air envelops all and is continuous. Attacks are not confined to the front lines or

to military targets. The second World War was a total war, in which the old international conventions and codes of honour regarding the waging of war were violated by all the belligerents. General destruction of everything became the rule or necessity under the new type of war. And wars in the future — in the atomic age — will be yet more destructive and indiscriminate in their destruction and indescribable in their range and intensity of devastation. Total wars necessitate absolute governments.

I am not justifying the restrictions on individual liberty or the special powers of the executive. I am dealing with the subject as a University man. Granting that in the discharge of their national responsibility our Prime Minister and his colleagues had come to the conclusion that conditions in India had grown dangerous and might grow worse; and that the first necessity of the times was discipline and not democracy and individual liberty, could we say that they are acting unreasonably? It may be that while in principle they are in the right, in actual administration, avoidable injustice has been caused. That is what has really happened as could be seen from the judgments of the High Courts. It is indeed sad and regrettable that there should have been what may be called administrative and Police zoolum. Mr. Nehru has dealt with this frankly in his report. Some of these may have been avoided if our governments had functioned in the spirit in which our leaders criticised the British.

Another point in which historical realism has given a new direction, divergent from the old principles and policies advocated by our leaders, is centralisation of power under the present Constitution. I remember in the old days a leader of the Congress declaring, "Give me real provincial autonomy. I do not care what Constitution you have at the Centre". I can understand why he said this; for, if they gave real provincial autonomy, then with that leverage we could bully the Centre to bow to the people's will. I think it was a tactical statement; but it also involved a principle, namely, that our linguistic provinces with their special cultures ought to be given a chance of developing, within limits, on their own lines. In the first draft of our Constitution, State Rights, as they are called in America, or Provincial Autonomy to use our vocabulary, were quite prominent. I told the Dhar Committee that though it was better than what I had anticipated from the statements and sentiments of Congress leaders, it was not good enough. I was one of those that felt that in the conditions of our country, so much provincial autonomy was dangerous; that the idea of pro-

vincial autonomy would have to be revised, and that greater centralisation should be adopted. The revised Constitution now adopted is, in my opinion, far better than what I anticipated would be the case from the previous declarations of Congress leaders. I told the Dhar Committee that I did not want the Indian Constitution to be based on the model of the United States or of Australia. It should be something between Canada and the South African Union. After the first draft of the Constitution was prepared, things happened in India. There was the tragic assassination of Gandhiji. There were outbursts of provincialism. The Central Government appeared to have become somewhat disturbed over the attitude of the Sikhs and the Maharastrians. As I told the Dhar Committee, the psychology of the Mahrattas, the Sikhs and perhaps the Andhras was bound to be rather different from that of other people. I hope my Muslim friends here will not be offended if I briefly state my views. Chronologically, the Andhras were the first to wage a fairly successful war for a couple of hundred years against the Mahomedans of the Bhamini kingdoms. Then, two other races took up the struggle, the Marattas and the Sikhs. In the history of the British period you read of Maratta wars. You read of Sikh wars. You don't read of Moghul wars. So, I told the Dhar Committee that the memories and psychology of the Marattas, Sikhs and Andhras might be rather different from that of the people in other parts of Central India, excepting perhaps the Rajputs, who did not put up anything like a stiff, strong resistance. Granting all this to be true, could any Government, intent on preserving the integrity of India, remain quiet, if it has reason to believe that there might be a possibility of separatist movements? Then, there is that great and tragic problem the most heart-rending in our history : that of the millions of Refugees. It is an All-India problem. Left to particular provinces, its solution may become difficult, perhaps impossible. We have to settle our unfortunate Sikh, Bengal, Sindhi and other compatriots in Mysore, Madras, Central Provinces and all over India, wherever space could be had or made. Obviously a matter for urgent Central regulation.

The more disturbed the internal conditions of a country is, the more exposed it is to possible aggression from outside, the stronger will have to be the Central Government and our armed forces. This is the law of national existence. Don't think I am defending the Central Government. I am no party man. I am trying to put before you the pros and cons. You can draw your own conclusions.

The Constituent Assembly appointed a Drafting Committee. It was supposed to put into legal form the first draft of the Constitution and the resolutions of the Constituent Assembly. But, as a matter of fact, the Drafting Committee became a drastically Revising Committee. It reduced provincial autonomy. They started with the United States as the model on which to found our Constitution. They ended their journey somewhere in the South African Union, where we are not well treated! Why, they did not even think a second chamber to be necessary in the States or Provinces.

Provincial autonomy is a waning moon. It is in Krishna Paksha. If we do not acquit ourselves better and more efficiently, it may be swallowed up by Amavasya. Mr. Manu Subedar, in a recent speech, told us that provincial autonomy should be abolished and that the provinces should be administered through a Central Agency. There is some point in this idea. Under the original draft of the Constitution, the Governors were to have been elected by the people of the Provinces. But under the Constitution, as adopted, they would be appointed by the President. Another reason that has led to this Centralisation is the merger of five hundred or six hundred Indian States. The people there have not been prepared for any kind of democracy or self-government. It is not only a virgin but sterile soil for popular Government. A third of India, geographically speaking — and perhaps a larger proportion, now that India has been partitioned, — had to be given a place in our Constitution. Nobody could say that they, excepting a few like Mysore, are fit for provincial autonomy. It, therefore, followed that if we were going to have a uniform system of administration in India for all States, Provinces or other units, we should go slow with Democracy and advance more gradually towards provincial autonomy. After all, we need not trouble ourselves unduly about the present Constitution. No Constitution is going to be eternal, especially in our country where logic fascinates more than life. Life moves more slowly than logic. New theories may spring up. They have already sprung up.

This morning Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan declared that as soon as the Socialists came into power, they would summon another Constituent Assembly to draft another Constitution. I suppose it is open to the Congress to retort by saying that when they, in their turn, come into power, they would summon yet another Constituent Assembly. The abstract Indian mind is likely to chase the clouds and miss the solid ground.

There is another problem also that points to the need for a strong Centralised Government. It is too late in the day to go into the ethics or expediency of the Partitioning of India. It has certainly erupted problems like a volcano which were either not foreseen by our leaders, or the horrible nature and extent of which were not realised. There is nothing so melancholy as the confession of our leaders that they agreed to Partition thinking it would lead to permanent peace. Our leaders have always treated history as a minor consideration in determining their politics ; and history has had its revenge. We know what Partition has led to ; we know, or should know, what it may yet lead to. The frontier between Pakistan and the Indian Union is not going to be like the frontier between the United States and Canada. It would be far more like the frontier between Germany and France. What is the moral of it ? Germany prevailed over France in 1870, 1914 and 1939-40. Thrice it beat France, twice to its knees, and in between almost to its knees. And Germany had the advantage of a strong Central Government with no show of democracy about it. Let us have a strong Central Government of course with the show !

Now it is a question for students of history to ponder over whether under similar conditions, they would give full autonomy to Rajasthan, Jaisalmer, Bikaner and other frontier regions ; or whether they would rule with strong hand and arm from one strong Centre. Could we have two types of units in the country, frontier States with less self-government, and States at greater distance from the zones of danger with more self-government ? The question of provincial autonomy is not a straight, simple, easy problem.

At one time Mr. Jinnah and myself were in close understanding with each other. It was in the autumn of 1941 that I realised that his mind was irretrievably set on Partition ; and that ended my collaboration. He said so to me frankly — he was always frank, and never resorted to foxing. But until then he did not pronounce himself to be against an integral India. One of the things that Mr. Jinnah said to me was that he would rather reconcile himself to a Unitary India, but never to Federation. If there was a Unitary Government, that would make some difference to him, because one Centre in which the Muslims would not be without power would be in control of the entire country. Well, this is only a biographical reminiscence of no value to our present politics. What I want you to realise is how events — the actualities of today, the requirements of tomorrow and the necessities of our country's future — have produced changes in Congress policy which look

like a departure from its previous declarations. The discharge of the big gun, Independence, has produced a recoil. After all, the main thing to be considered is whether the present policy of our Government serves the real, true and permanent interests of the country or not. When I think of the " isms " that are springing up, while Kashmir may light up a terrible conflagration, I am bewildered at the sense of irresponsibility which some of us are displaying. If fights go on between Socialism, Communism, Communalism, Rightism, Leftism and the rest of the isms, some other ism will come from outside and plunge us into a most horrible wrongism. This is the time for unity and solidarity for the single purpose of security and the needful power, to which all other considerations must be duly subordinated.

Centralisation has led to another feature of our Constitution. As originally provided, our Constitution was, to a striking extent, based on the principle of separation of powers, the doctrine of the French Revolution. The Executive, the Judiciary and the Legislative powers of the State were to be as far as possible distinct, separate, and each an aspect of sovereignty as in the United States. This was the great Theory of State propounded by one of the greatest political thinkers of the world, Montesquieu. The Drafting Committee came, and along with it Centralisation, giving the Executive more powers and a wider range. The new President of the Indian Union would be a King without a crown. He could issue Ordinances and do many other things in the exercise of his prerogatives. I suppose Centralisation necessarily implies greater executive competence. A curious feature about our system is that our President is elected after the French fashion, namely, by Representatives already returned to the Legislatures and not directly by the people as is the case in America. But his powers are more like the powers of the American President and even wider. We must suppose that the President in India both in the matter of his powers and the mode of his election suits our conditions and our times. The probabilities are that this Presidential system would work well in the circumstances of our country.

At one time it was our boast that we were not going to have anything foreign, that everything here would be of indigenous growth dug from vedic soil and re-planted in this age of Kali. I am glad that this sort of nationalistic atavism which once upon a time inflated our vanity, has been discarded. The present Constitution is a mosaic with materials and patterns drawn from every part of the world and mostly from the contemporary world. The other

day Mr. Nehru emphasised the need for us to assimilate all that was best in every civilisation. If we believe in One World, one Humanity and one God as we are supposed to do, then why worry whether we are importing ideas from England, America or Japan, or extracting them from our ancient history. That kind of narrow nationalism will have to be superseded by living, universal humanism.

In the Centre, at all events, we are following a course lighted by history and realism. The colourful lights of fancy are no longer the doctrines that they were once, excepting, of course, in our oratorical perorations. I hope this spirit of historical realism will be more evident in the Provinces too. Under conditions of internal squabbles, it was but natural for Local Government to try and operate the orthodox creed of the Party ; but with experience and under the guidance of the Centre and the bigger minds of India, they also will fall into line. The time is not far distant when the centre and the circumference will move together as one grand, integrated, harmonious whole.

The achievements of our Democracy have been wonderful. India has been integrated but it is yet to be consolidated, a somewhat different proposition. We have advanced remarkably in every direction of national life and modernism. Sciences have been promoted. Researches on a colossal scale have been organized. In Industry our enterprise is many-sided. Reservoirs, Dams, Power Installations and such like have been undertaken on an American scale and magnitude. But for Partition and the need it has imposed on us for spending enormous amounts on security measures, our progress in the arts of peace would have been a miracle of history. We are essentially a people of constructive genius. Had we not been exposed to destructive dangers, and the situation as regards the world as well as the nation had not been so ominous, we could have realised our nature to a fuller, more glorious extent. But we have no choice. We must face things as they are and do the best we can to safeguard security and to achieve prosperity.

The Industrial and Commercial policies of our Governments have been such as to upset private enterprise and economic advancement through private enterprise. Universal franchise has been installed more as a tribute to theory than as a historical development of our national life. Politicians are subject to the natural temptation of promising a new heaven on earth in order to gain the votes of the multitude. The kind of conservatism, in the best sense of the word, which characterises the policies of all the Parties

in England and in America, is not in sufficient evidence in India. Our politicians are bidding against each other, and there seems to be no limit to the bids. If the Zamindari system is to be abolished — I am not opposed to it — one democrat would give compensation based on ten years' rental; a greater democrat would reduce it to five years' rental and a still greater democrat would pay no compensation at all! Every Minister speaks on every department and subject belonging to this world and the next. The idea that each one should confine himself to his particular sphere, study carefully, consult learned or experienced opinion, take the views of the officials and go slow in order to be able to go with sure and steady step, does not seem to have a compelling appeal to some of our leaders. One can understand why. In every revolution in order to generate the necessary amount of force, we have to make all kinds of declarations, some at least of which are extravagant and unrealisable. It is practical politics. Otherwise you cannot muster the popular strength necessary. Later when we are confronted with our own statements, made when we were in a position of greater freedom and less responsibility, we are put in a difficult position. But such incidents cannot be helped, and they should not be allowed to affect our course too badly.

Our achievements have been great and they would have been still greater if there had been more discipline in the country and our consideration of problems had been more realistic. Would I anticipate the future? I am not an astrologer. I can only speak guardedly and with hesitation. There seems to be hardly much of a future in India for Parliamentary Democracy of the Anglo-Saxon type. We may have something different, suited to our conditions and our psychology. As a matter of fact, the Anglo-Saxon type, which we are trying to imitate, has not flourished in many countries. It requires certain conditions, internal and external. They are not forthcoming in India, they are not likely to come forth in a hurry. We do not seem to be set in that direction. But the way the Centre has been functioning makes me feel that constitutionalism and the spirit of constitutionalism, whether of the Anglo-Saxon pattern or some thing else, adjusted to our life and environment would be forthcoming. I would not attach too much importance to the letter of the Constitution. As I mentioned yesterday, there may be unforeseen tendencies. Sections introduced for one purpose may lead to some other purpose, better or worse. If worse, the Section will be amended; if better, it would be kept in letter and operated in spirit. We have not reached stable conditions. Internal divergencies are far too many. Rightly

did Mr. Nehru bemoan the other day our internal weaknesses. He said he was not afraid of external aggression but it was the internal conditions that were causing him concern. We need more discipline. Just as in the light of events and experience, we have superseded impossible idealisms and freakisms by historical realism, we may develop yet further in the same way and make our future unassailably secure and nobly prosperous. The life, the honour and the integrity of our country are involved in our policies and activities. We should be more careful than we have been till now of our national interest and see to it that by all the means within our power and resources, we promote the strength and solidarity of our country.

I would like to conclude with a request to the gentlemen of the Honours and Post-Graduate Departments in Political Science. There is a reason why things come into being and an explanation, whether you regard them as satisfactory or not. It would be interesting if you could prepare a chart of the pre-1947 declarations of our leaders regarding the future Constitution of India, Civil Liberties, etc., the provisions made in the first draft of our Constitution; and the provisions now embodied by the Drafting Committee — our Drastic Committee — and ask yourselves why these changes have come about. Our leaders know Politics at least as much as students. Therefore, they must have been actuated by important objects and cogent reasons. That would be one of the finest studies in the Comparative Politics of our country. It will also throw light on possible trends in the future. You should take up the task here and now, because the material is growing rapidly and soon you will be submerged under the weight of the data accumulating. With such materials as we have got now, we should carry on the investigation and draw our inferences. These studies are a plastic art — the fine art of modelling. Start with a lump of clay and mould it to a certain shape. The next day you may yourself, in the light of further impressions, alter the shape. Or, another gentleman — and may be another generation — takes up the work and the figure undergoes further improvements. With time and experience and the changing reflected light of actual results, new poses and new colours may have to be introduced. We are all creatures of time. If we are metaphysically minded and wait till things reach perfection or finality and an unchangeable condition, we shall do nothing, we shall achieve nothing. I want my friends of the Honours, and Post-Graduate Departments to undertake this comparative study and give us the results of their researches.

Mr. Vice-Chancellor, I could not bring myself to refuse your kind invitation to deliver these lectures. I do not make speeches very often. And if a tax on speeches is imposed, it would not bring in much revenue from me. It is the honourable tradition of Universities not to decline each other's invitation. If I asked one of your teachers to accept an examinership in Andhra, though it is couched in the form of an invitation, it is really honoured as an order. So, when you invited me to deliver these lectures, I felt it an order which I could not disobey.

I am an old boy of the Madras University, about whom it has been said, "He is old but still boyish". I have a deep affection to my *Alma Mater*, not to speak of duty. These lectures are in memory of my friend, the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar, a man of great power of thought and of speech and who was an influence for good in our politics for a number of years. I was diffident whether I would be able to come up to the standard which ought to be maintained by anybody speaking in commemoration of the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar. The generosity of my audience has made up for my deficiencies.

* * * *

Dr. Sir A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar, proposing a vote of thanks, said :

> It is not because I wish to fulfil a convention that I request your patience for a few minutes when I convey to Dr. Reddy the sincere and grateful thanks of the University of Madras for his kindness and condescension in accepting our invitation to deliver the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar Endowment Lecture. As I told you yesterday, we could not have made a better choice, and I knew perfectly well that a dynamic mind like his would have been working on the many problems that are facing our country not merely in the 'academician' spirit but also in the true 'politician' spirit so that there may be a harmonious blending of academic thought with practical realities. It is not for me to speak of his lectures. Both yesterday and today they were an intellectual treat of the highest order. But what I do admire most is that in doing it so forcibly, in expressing himself in no uncertain terms, and in criticising men, and matters as he ought to do if he were to be honest to himself, he did not for once get off the academic level at which one ought to deliver any lecture or a series of lectures under the auspices of the University. I am truly grateful to Dr. Reddy for he has presented us all, not merely those

connected with the University, but every single citizen, with an abundance of thought for rumination. He has also given us an insight into the many problems that are facing us in our country. We all speak of democracy and we cry out 'democracy'. But very often it takes strange shapes. Few of the legislators — I am one among them for the time being, and I may include myself also — realise what true democracy is. I am really grateful to you, Sir, for the exposition that you have given about the supremacy of the legislature over any party, however strong numerically it may be. But I feel that we are forgetting for the time being that some of the greatest safeguards of democracy have to be protected not merely by those who are sent to legislatures but more largely and more truly by the bulk of the people who have to conserve that democracy if they wish to preserve the legislature as the finest forum to develop democratic institutions. From that point of view, I do hope that it will be possible not merely for the Leader of the Government but for the Leader of the Opposition also to function as a true leader of public opinion wherever it is necessary, and not act on that remark which I once heard, namely, the duty of a Government is to govern and the duty of the Opposition is to oppose.

I am also truly grateful to you for emphasising this fact that our safeguards lie in the judiciary of the country. They are of necessity to interpret the Constitution. There are two types of Constitution the unwritten and the written. Difficult as it may be to unravel the mysteries of the unwritten Constitution, it will be far more difficult to unravel the theories and propositions of a written Constitution especially when lawyers abound as they do in our country. The result is that a great and onerous responsibility is cast upon the judiciary and the highest tribunals of the land. I do hope that, as they have done so splendidly in the past, they will continue to do so in the future and realise that they have a place in the democratic form of Government which can hardly be questioned by anybody, a place of supreme importance to preserve the democratic institutions of the country and the individual liberty of every citizen. I am glad also, Sir, that you referred to the civil service which is really the steel frame as it was once ironically called. But as our leaders realise the civil service should be the steel frame of our country. There is nothing more damaging than to spoil the harmony and the integrity of the civil service in any country. Politicians come and go. Men may come and may go. But the civil service goes on for ever. It is on the integrity, the independent and virile thinking and the just pronouncements of the high officials in the Secretariat that Parliaments and Ministeries even in Great Britain have to depend for their work. If a high-placed civil servant were to say that it is a wrong thing to do, the Minister takes his advice.

Lastly, you have referred to public opinion which must ever be on the watch checking the historical trends not only in this country but in the world abroad. Time has annihilated distances. It is not

possible, as you very rightly mentioned, to create frontiers, artificial or real, and to protect ourselves and to dig ourselves in our village republics in this year of Grace, 1949. I well remember the perturbation that was caused by a statement that was made by a high placed leader of a party when he referred to a particular country being merged with India. I was then in Europe, and I can tell you, Sir, that one statement disturbed public opinion for almost 24 hours, till our Prime Minister issued a contradiction. That reminds me that public expression of opinion by leaders must be made with a due sense of responsibility that India is no longer under a foreign Government and that it is an independent self-governing country which has got to play its rôle in foreign affairs. Therefore, the less people speak about foreign affairs without knowing the A, B, C of it, the better will it be.

Of the Press, may I also say how much we owe and how much we hope we may owe in the future to them for the lead that they have given, the right lead in reality that ought to help us towards understanding the problems of democracy. I shall not stand much longer before you. I feel so full of thanks to the lecturer for having stimulated so much of thought and so much of not merely intellectual curiosity, but curiosity, which I hope, will be translated into practical measures by all who have listened to him. They are not merely confined to the four corners of this room. They are not confined to the large number that are in the grass plots outside, but a much larger audience in the whole of India. Your advice and your admonitions, given with so much of grace, will, I hope, go home to the right quarters, and in the future we shall have cause to thank you for the lead you have given.

On behalf of the University and on behalf of you all present, once more I extend our warmest thanks. This will not, by any means, be the last occasion when you will honour us with your presence and give us the benefit of your sage counsel and advice.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY

(Text-books, Calendars and Question Papers have been omitted.)

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Sources of Vizianagar History, by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, available from the Superintendent, Govt. Press, Mount Road, Madras .. .. .. each	4	8	0
The Nayaks of Madura, by Mr. R. Satyanatha Ayyar, available at the Oxford University Press, Madras	†8	0	0
History of Pallavas, by Mr. R. Gopalan, M.A.	5	0	0*
Hindu Administrative Institutions, by Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar	6	0	0*
Historical Inscriptions of S. India, by Robert Sewell. Ed. by Dr. S. K. Aiyangar ..	10	0	0*
Origin and Early History of Saivism in India, by Mr. C. V. Narayanan	5	0	0*
Studies in Cola History and Administration, by Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri	4	0	0
Mauriyan Polity, by Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar	6	0	0*
The Colas, by Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri			
Vol. I.	8	0	0*
Vol. II.	10	0	0*
Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara, by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya ..	5	0	0
Economic Conditions in Southern India (A.D. 1000-1500). Vols. I and II, by Dr. A. Appadorai ..	10	0	0
Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas, by Dr. C. Minakshi	5	0	0
Foreign Notices of South India, by Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri	4	8	0*
Some Aspects of Vayu Purana, by Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar. (Reprinted from the Journal of the Madras University)	1	0	0*

† Members of the staff of colleges will be offered copies of the book for sale at Rs. 2 per copy. Applications for copies should be endorsed by the Principals of the Colleges concerned.

* Out of stock.

M. 11

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Dutch Beginnings in India Proper, by Mr. T. I. Poonen	1	0	0
A Report on the Modi MSS. in the Tanjore Palace Library, by Mr. R. S. Shelvankar	1	0	0
Vijayanagar—The Origin of the City and the Empire, by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya	2	0	0*
The Matsya Purana—A Study, by Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar	1	0	0*
Velugotivarivamsavali, by Dr. N. Venkata Ramanayya	2	0	0
Administration and Social Life under Vijayanagar, by Mr. T. V. Mahalingam	7	0	0
Historical Method in Relation to Problems of South Indian History, by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri	1	12	0
Lalita Cult, by V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar	3	0	0
The Early Muslim Expansion in South India, by N. Venkataramanayya	6	8	0*
Early History of the Andhra Country, by Mr. K. Gopalachari	5	8	0
Further Sources of Vijayanagar History—3 Vols., by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Dr. N. Venkataramanayya	21	0	0

DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT

Katyayana Pratisakhya, Ed. by Pandit V. Venkatarama Sarma ..	4	0	0
Rgvedanukramani of Madhava Bhatta, Vol. I, Ed. by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja	3	8	0*
Brhati, Ed. by Pandit S. K. Ramanatha Sastri			
Part I	5	0	0
Part II	2	8	0
Linganuasasana, Ed. by Pandit V. Venkatarama Sharma ..	1	8	0
Taittiriya Pratisakhya, Ed. by Pandit V. Venkatarama Sharma ..	2	0	0
Critical Studies on Katyayana's Sukla Yajurveda Pratisakhya, Part I, by Pandit V. Venkatarama Sharma	4	0	0

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Spotasiddhi, by Pandit S. K. Ramanatha Sastri	3	0	0
The Unadi Sutras in Various Recensions, Ed. by Dr. T. R. Chintamani—Part I	3	0	0
" " " II	2	8	0
" " " IV	4	0	0
" " " VI	4	0	0*
The Rg Veda Bhashya of Skandaswamin (First Astaka)— Ed. by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja	6	0	0
Prakatarthavivaranam, Vols. I and II Ed. by Dr. T. R. Chintamani (Vol. I out of stock)	13	0	0
Nanarthasangraha of Ajayapala, by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	1	8	0
Sarasvatikanthabharana of Bhojadeva, Edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	6	0	0
Nayaviveka of Bhavanatha Misra, Edited by Pandit S. K. Ramanatha Sastri ..	3	0	0
Sahityaratnakara, by Dr. T. R. Chintamani (Reprinted from the *Journal of the Madras University*)	1	0	0
Raghunathabhyudaya of Ramabhadramba, Edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	1	0	0
Sarvatobhadra of Ramakanthacharya, Ed. by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	5	4	0
Vararucaniruktasamuccaya, by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja	2	0	0*
Slokavartika Vyakhya by Umveka, Edited by S. K. Ramanatha Sastri	[illegible]	[illegible]	0
Prakriyasarvasva by Narayana Edited by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja	3	4	0
Slokavartikatika (Sarkarika) of Bhattapura-Jaya Misra Ed. by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja	3	8	0
Pancaprakriya of Sarvajnanatman Edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	2	8	0
Kausitaka Grhya Sutra, by Dr. T. R. Chintamani	4	8	0
New Catalogus Catalogorum an alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and allied works and authors, Vol. I-A prepared by Dr. V. Raghavan	25	0	0

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY			
The Siddhantalesa sangraha of Appayya Diksita, Ed. by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri			
Vol. I.	5	0	0*
Vol. II. Roman and Sanskrit Text ..	3	0	0
Sanskrit Text	1	8	0*
Samkhya Karika Studied in the Light of the Chinese Version (Bulletin No. I), by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. (Reprinted from the *Journal of the Madras University*) ..	1	0	0*
Sivadvaita Nirnaya, by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri, M.A., B.Sc. ..	2	8	0
A Critique of Difference (A free English Rendering Bhedadhikkara of Narasimhasramin), by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri and Mr. T. M. P. Mahadevan	1	0	0
Tattvasuddhi of Jnanaghanapada, An Advaita Classic of about the 10th century A.D., Edited by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri and E. P. Radhakrishnan	3	0	0*
Sivadvaita of Srikanta, by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri	5	0	0
Sankhyakarika, (3rd edition) by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri	3	8	0
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS			
Some South Indian Villages, by Dr. G. Slater. Available at the Oxford University Press, Madras .. .. each	5	0	0*
Industrial Welfare in India, by Dr. P. S. Lokanathan, M.A., D.Sc.	4	0	0
Indian Agricultural Statistics, by Dr. P. J. Thomas and Mr. N. Sundararama Sastry	3	0	0
The Economic Results of Prohibition in the Salem District, by Dr. P. J. Thomas	1	0	0
Commodity Prices in S. India, 1918-1938, by Dr. P. J. Thomas and Mr. N. Sundararama Sastry (Bulletin)	1	0	0
Handloom Industry in South India, by Dr. K. S. Venkataraman (Bulletin) ..	3	0	0*
Some South Indian Villages: A Resurvey, Edited by Dr. P. J. Thomas and Mr. K. C. Ramakrishnan	9	0	0

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Economic Conditions in the Madras Presidency 1800-1850, by A. Sarada Raju	10	0	0
Madras Agriculture by C. W. B. Zacharias	15	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF MALAYALAM			
Kucelevrttam and Krishnavilasam, by Dr. C. Achyuta Menon, B.A., Ph.D. (London)	1	0	0
Subadraharanam, by Mr. V. T. Sreemanavikrama Panikkar ..	1	0	0
Ballads of North Malabar, Vol. I, by Dr. C. Achyuta Menon, B.A., Ph.D. (London)	3	0	0
Kavyajivita Vrtti, by Mr. P. Krishnan Nair			
Vol. I	4	0	0
Vol. II	6	0	0
Attakkatha, by Mr. P. Krishnan Nair	2	8	0
Ezuttaccan and His Age—A Critical Study in English of Ezuttaccan, the Epic poet of Kerala. By Dr. C. Achyuta Menon, B.A., Ph.D. (London) ..	3	0	0
Kavyalokam, Vol. I. by Mr. P. Krishnan Nair	4	0	0
Kali-worship in Kerala, by Dr. C. Achyuta Menon	5	0	0
DEPARTMENT OF TAMIL			
Agastiya in the Tamil Land, by Mr. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B.A.	1	0	0
Purananutrin Palamai, by Mr. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B.A.	0	12	0
Chronology of the Early Tamils, by Mr. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai	0	12	0
Paranar, by Mr. V. Venkatarajulu Reddiyar	2	8	0
Kapilar, by Mr. V. Venkatarajulu Reddiar ..	2	0	0
Nanartha Dipikai, by S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai	6	0	0
Sri Sivagra Yogin's Siva-Neri Prakasam, by S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai	1	8	0
Purattirattu, 2nd Edition by Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai	2	8	0*
Kayataram, by Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai	1	0	0
Dravidic Pronouns, by Mr. V. Venkatarajulu Reddiar	1	0	0*
Grammatical Essays, by Mr. V. Venkatarajulu Reddiar	1	0	0*

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Sources of the History of the Nawwabs of the Carnatic,—Part II by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar ..	5	0	0
Sources of the History of the Nawwabs of the Carnatic,—Part III by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar ..	3	0	0
Sources of the History of the Nawwabs of the Carnatic—Part IV, by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar	4	0	0
Seydakkadi Nondi Natakam, by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar (Bulletin No. 3)	0	12	0*
Hindi, High Hindi, Urdu, Dhakni Hindustani, by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar (Bulletin No. 4)	0	12	0*
Tuhfat-Al-Mujahidin—English Version, by Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar (Bulletin No. 5)	1	0	0*
Diwan-I-Azfari, by Mr. Muhammad Husayn Mahvi	1	8	0
Waqiat-I-Azfari, by Mr. Muhammad Husayn Mahvi	2	8	0
Anwar Nama of Abjadi, Parts I & II, by Mr. Muhammad Husayn Mahvi	20	0	0
Diwan-I-Bedar, by Mr. Muhammad Husayn Mahvi (Bulletin No. 2)	2	8	0
Arab Geographers' Knowledge of Southern India, by Mr. Muhammad Husayn Nainar	6	4	0
Futhus-Salatin by Mr. A. Syed Usha	15	8	0

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

History of Sri Vaishnavas, by Mr. R. Gopinatha Rao	0	10	0
Psychological Tests of Mental Abilities, by Dr. A. S. Woodburne	2	8	0
A Study of the Optical Properties of Potassium Vapour, by Dr. A. L. Narayan	1	12	0
Absorption Spectra and their Bearing on the Structure of Atoms and Molecules, by Dr. A. L. Narayan	0	8	0
Investigations on the molecular scattering of light, by Dr. K. R. Ramanathan	1	12	0

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
The Kaveri, the Maukhari and the Sangam Age, by Mr. T. G. Aravamudan	2	4	0
Stone Age in India, by Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Aiyangar, M.A. ..	1	0	0
Anatomical and Taxonomic Studies of some Indian fresh and Amphibious Gastropods, by Mr. H. Srinivasa Rao, M.A., D.Sc.	1	4	0
India through the Ages, by Dr. Jadunath Sirkar, Kt., M.A., Ph.D. ..	1	8	0*
Political Theory of the Govt. of India, by Mr. M. Ruthnaswami, M.A., C.I.E. ..	1	0	0
Ante-natal, Natal, Neo-natal, mortality of infants, by Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, M.D., L.R.C.P.	2	0	0
Critical Survey of the Malayalam Language and Literature, by Mr. A. Krishna Pisharoti	0	8	0*
Records of the Indian Museum, Vol. XXXI, Part I, by Mr. K. S. Padmanabha Ayyar	1	0	0*
Restricted Relativity, by the Rev. D. Ferroli, S.J., D.Sc.	4	0	0
Rasa and Dhvani, by Dr. A. Sankaran, M.A., Ph.D.	1	12	0
Essay on the Origin of South Indian Temple, by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya	1	8	0
Indian Currency System, 1835-1926, by Sir J. C. Coyajee	5	0	0
Political Theory of Imperialism, by Prof. K. Zachariah	0	8	0*
Problems of World Economy, by Prof. V. G. Kale	2	0	0
Civilization as a Co-operative Adventure, (Principal Miller Lectures of 1931) by Prof. A. R. Wadia. (Reprinted from the *Journal of the Madras University*)	0	8	0*
The Anatomy and Mechanism of the Tongue of Rana Lexadactyla, by Mr. C. P. Gnanamuthu (Thesis for the Maharaja of Travancore Curzon Price, 1931)	1	0	0
An Indian Federation, by Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, M.L.A. (Reprinted from the Journal of the Madras University)	0	12	0
The Challenge of the Temporal Process, Principal Miller Lectures for 1933—by Dr. A. G. Hogg	0	8	0

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
Purpose and Progress, Principal Miller Lectures for 1934—by the Rev. John Mackenzie	0	8	0
Considerations on some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, Sir Subrahmanya Ayyar Lectures, 1914—by Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar (Second Ed.)	2	0	0
Inter-Statal Law, The Law affecting the Relations of the Indian States with the British Crown—by Sirdar K. M. Panikkar (Sundaram Ayyar—Krishnaswami Ayyar Lectures for 1933-34)	1	0	0
Problems in Filariasis. (Maharaja of Travancore Curzon Lectures, 1934-35), by Dr. T. Bhaskara Menon, M.D.	1	0	0
Some Trends of Modern Public Finance with Special Reference to India. (Sir William Meyer Lecture, 1934). by Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar ..	2	8	0
Studies in Tamil Literature and History, by V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar	5	0	0*
The Marriage Customs and Songs of the Syrian Christians of Malabar, by Dr. P. J. Thomas (reprinted from the Indian Languages Number of the University Journal April 1936)	0	8	0
Humanism and Indian Thought, by Mr. A. Chakravarti (Principal Miller Lectures 1935)	0	8	0
Indian Political Theories, by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. (Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri Lectures 1936-37)	0	8	0*
Opthalmology in its Relation to Clinical Medicine, by Rao Bahadur Dr. K. Koman Nayar (Maharaja of Travancore Curzon Prize Lectures, Medicine, 1936-37).	0	8	0
A Critique of Nicolai Hartmann's Ethics, by Mr. P. V. S. Narayana, M.A., B.L. ..	1	8	0
Individual and Social Progress, by Mr. Hari Das Bhattacharyya	0	8	0
Pre-Historic Civilization of the Indus Valley, by Mr. K. N. Dikshit	2	0	0*

* Out of stock.

University publications—(continued)

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
The Regional Balance of Man by Dr. Radha Kamal Mukherji	5	0	0
Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture, by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar	2	0	0
Tamil Lexicon:			
Vol. I—Part I	4	0	0
,, ,, II	4	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
Vol. II—Part I	2	0	0
,, ,, II	2	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
,, ,, IV and Vol. III—Part I ..	2	0	0
Vol. III—Part II	2	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
,, ,, IV	2	0	0
,, ,, V	2	0	0
Vol. IV—Part I	2	0	0
,, ,, II	2	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
,, ,, IV	2	0	0
Vol. V—Part I	2	0	0
,, ,, II	2	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
,, ,, IV	2	0	0
Vol. VI—Part I	2	0	0
,, ,, II	2	0	0
,, ,, III	2	0	0
,, ,, IV	2	0	0
,, ,, V	2	0	0
Tamil Lexicon Supplement, Part I	2	0	0
,, ,, ,, II	2	0	0
,, ,, ,, III	1	4	0

Note:—Complete bound sets of Tamil Lexicon are offered for sale at Rs. 80 (net) a set exclusive of postage and other charges.

93189

University publications—(continued)

Latest additions

Name of Publications	*Price.* Rs.	A.	P.
The Individual in Progress, by Prof. P. Narasimham (Principal Miller Lectures 1939-40)	0	8	0
Diploe Moments in Chemistry, by Dr. A. Govinda Rao	0	8	0
Ahimsa and Asanga, by Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Ayyar (Besant Memorial Lectures)	0	8	0*
Rudra Siva, by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya (Sir Subramanya Ayyar Lectures, 1939-40)	5	0	0
Quest After Perfection, by Mr. M. Hiriyanna (Principal Miller Lectures)	0	8	0
The New Constitution and After, by Sir Shaafat Ahmad Khan (Rt. Hon. V. S. Sastri Lectures, 1941-42)	3	0	0
Kambuja-Desa, by Dr. R. C. Majumdar (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1942-43)	4	0	0
Reorganising of Education in the Madras Presidency —Report of the Special Committee appointed by the Syndicate to examine problems of Post-War Educational Reconstruction	0	12	0
Madras Finance by Dr. B. V. Narayanaswami Naidu	5	0	0
History of Sri Vijaya (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1946-47) by Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri	10	0	0

* Out of stock.

G. S. PRESS, MADRAS